arXiv:0901.0352v2 [math.AP] 13 Feb 2009

Compressible flows with a density-dependent viscosity coefficient*

Ting Zhang†, Daoyuan Fang‡

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China

Abstract

We prove the global existence of weak solutions for the 2-D compressible Navier-Stokes equations with a density-dependent viscosity coefficient ($\lambda = \lambda(\rho)$). Initial data and solutions are small in energy-norm with nonnegative densities having arbitrarily large sup-norm. Then, we show that if there is a vacuum domain at the initial time, then the vacuum domain will retain for all time, and vanishes as time goes to infinity. At last, we show that the condition of μ =constant will induce a singularity of the system at vacuum. Thus, the viscosity coefficient μ plays a key role in the Navier-Stokes equations.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following 2-D compressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\rho_t+\operatorname{div}(\rho u)=0,\\ (\rho u)_t+\operatorname{div}(\rho u\otimes u)+\nabla P=\mu\Delta u+\nabla((\mu+\lambda(\rho))\operatorname{div}u)+\rho f,\end{array}\right. \tag{1.1}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t > 0$, with the boundary and initial conditions

$$u(x,t)\to 0,\ \rho(x,t)\to\tilde{\rho}>0,\quad \text{as } |x|\to\infty,\ t>0, \tag{1.2}$$

$$(\rho,u)|_{t=0}=(\rho_0,u_0). \tag{1.3}$$

Here $\rho(x,t)$, $u(x,t)$ and $P = P(\rho)$ stand for the fluid density, velocity and pressure respectively, f is a given external force, the dynamic viscosity coefficient μ is a positive constant, the second viscosity coefficient $\lambda = \lambda(\rho)$ is a function of ρ.

At first, we prove the global existence of weak solutions that are in an "intermediate" regularity class in which energies are small, but oscillations are arbitrarily large. Specifically, we fix a positive constant $\tilde{\rho}$, assume that $(\rho_0 - \tilde{\rho}, u_0)$ are small in L^2, and $(\rho_0, u_0) \in L^\infty \times H^1$ with no restrictions on their norms. Our existence result accommodates a wide class of pressures P, including pressures that are not monotone in ρ. Since the solutions may exhibit vacuum states and discontinuities in density and velocity gradient across hypersurfaces, our results are consequently much less regular and much more general than the well-known small-smooth theory, such as [4, 15]. This existence result generalizes and improves upon the earlier result of Vaigant-Kazhikhov [16] in two significant ways: the space domain is unbounded and the initial density may vanish in an open set. It also generalizes and improves upon earlier results of Hoff-Santos [6] and Hoff [7, 8, 9] in two significant ways: the second viscosity coefficient λ is a function of the density ρ, and we omit the condition $\int(1+|x|^2)^a(\rho_0|u_0|^2+G(\rho_0))dx \leq M_0$ with a constant $a > 0$.

We now give a precise formulation of our existence result.

Definition 1.1. We say that (ρ, u) is a weak solution of (1.1)–(1.3), if ρ and u are suitably integrable and satisfy that

---

*This work is supported by NSFC 10871175

†E-mail: zhangting79@hotmail.com

‡E-mail: dyf@zju.edu.cn

- $$\int \rho\phi dx\Big|_{t_1}^{t_2} = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int (\rho\phi_t + \rho u\cdot\nabla\phi)dxdt \tag{1.4}$$

  for all times $t_2 \geq t_1 \geq 0$ and all $\phi \in C_0^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \times [t_1, t_2])$,

- $$\begin{aligned} &\int \rho u\psi dx\Big|_{t_1}^{t_2} - \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int \{\rho u\cdot\psi_t + \rho(u\cdot\nabla\psi)\cdot u + P\mathrm{div}\psi\}dxdt \\ = \quad & -\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int \{\mu\partial_k u^j\partial_k\psi^j + (\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u\mathrm{div}\psi - \rho f\psi\}dxdt \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

  for all times $t_2 \geq t_1 \geq 0$ and all $\psi = (\psi^1, \psi^2) \in (C_0^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \times [t_1, t_2]))^2$.

Concerning the pressure P, viscosity coefficients μ and λ, we fix $0 < \tilde\rho < \bar\rho$ and assume that

$$\begin{cases} P \in C^1([0,\bar\rho]),\ \lambda \in C^2([0,\bar\rho]), \\ \mu > 0,\ \lambda(\rho) \geq 0,\ \rho \in [0,\bar\rho], \\ P(0) = 0,\ P'(\tilde\rho) > 0, \\ (\rho - \tilde\rho)[P(\rho) - P(\tilde\rho)] > 0,\ \rho \neq \tilde\rho,\ \rho \in [0,\bar\rho], \\ P \in C^2([0,\bar\rho]) \ \text{ or } \ \frac{P(\cdot)}{2\mu+\lambda(\cdot)} \ \text{ is a monotone function on } [0,\bar\rho]. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Let G be the potential energy density, defined by

$$G(\rho) = \rho\int_{\tilde\rho}^{\rho}\frac{P(s) - P(\tilde\rho)}{s^2}ds. \tag{1.7}$$

Then for any $g \in C^2([0,\bar\rho])$ with $g(\tilde\rho) = g'(\tilde\rho) = 0$, there is a constant C such that $|g(\rho)| \leq CG(\rho)$, $\rho \in [0,\bar\rho]$.

We measure the sizes of the initial data and the external force by

$$C_0 = \int\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho_0|u_0|^2 + G(\rho_0)\right)dx, \tag{1.8}$$

$$C_f = \sup_{t\geq 0}\|f(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^\infty\left(\|f(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2} + \|f(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \sigma^4\|\nabla f\|_{L^4}^4 + \sigma^3\|f_t(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt, \tag{1.9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M_q \quad = \quad & \int_0^\infty\left(\sigma^2\|f_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \sigma^3\|\nabla f\|_{L^4}^4 + \sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\|f_t\|_{L^{2+q}}^{2+q} + \sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\|\nabla f\|_{L^{4+2q}}^{4+2q}\right)dt \\ & + \int|\nabla u_0|^2dx + \sup_{t\geq 0}\|f\|_{L^{2+q}}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

where $\sigma(t) = \min\{1, t\}$ and q is a constant satisfying

$$q \in (0,2) \ \text{ and } q^2 < \frac{4\mu}{\mu+\lambda(\rho)},\ \forall\ \rho \in [0,\bar\rho].$$

As in [6, 7], we recall the definition of the vorticity matrix $w^{j,k} = \partial_k u^j - \partial_j u^k$, and define the function

$$F = (\lambda + 2\mu)\mathrm{div}u - P(\rho) + P(\tilde\rho). \tag{1.11}$$

We also define the convective derivative $\frac{D}{Dt}$ by $\frac{Dw}{Dt} = \dot w = w_t + u\cdot\nabla w$, the Hölder norm

$$< v >_A^\alpha = \sup_{\substack{x,y\in A \\ x\neq y}}\frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha},$$

and

$$< g >^{\alpha,\beta}_{A\times[t_1,t_2]} = \sup_{\substack{(x,t),(y,s)\in A\times[t_1,t_2]\\ (x,t)\neq(y,s)}} \frac{|g(x,t)-g(y,s)|}{|x-y|^\alpha+|t-s|^\beta},$$

where $v : A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $g : A \times [t_1, t_2] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1]$.

The following is the global existence result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that conditions (1.6)–(1.10) hold. Then, for a given positive number* M *(not necessarily small) and* $\bar\rho_1 \in (\tilde\rho, \bar\rho)$*, there are positive numbers* ε*,* C *and* θ*, such that, the Cauchy problem (1.1)–(1.3) with the initial data* (ρ_0, u_0) *and external force* f *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le \inf \rho_0 \le \sup \rho_0 \le \bar\rho_1, \\ C_0 + C_f \le \varepsilon, \\ M_q \le M, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

has a global weak solution (ρ, u) *in the sense of (1.4)–(1.5) satisfying*

$$C^{-1} \inf \rho_0 \le \rho \le \bar\rho, \ \ a.e. \tag{1.13}$$

$$\begin{cases} \rho - \tilde\rho, \ \rho u \in C([0,\infty); H^{-1}), \\ \nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,\infty)), \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

$$< u >^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2+2\alpha}}_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,\infty)} + \sup_{t\ge\tau} (\|\nabla F(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla w(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2}) \le C(\alpha,\tau)(C_0+C_f)^\theta, \tag{1.15}$$

$$\sup_{t>0} \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^\infty \int \sigma |\nabla \dot u|^2 dx ds \le C, \tag{1.16}$$

$$\int_0^T \|F(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty} dt \le C(T), \tag{1.17}$$

$$< F >^{\alpha', \frac{\alpha'}{2+2\alpha'}}_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T]} + < w >^{\alpha', \frac{\alpha'}{2+2\alpha'}}_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T]} \le C(\tau,T), \tag{1.18}$$

where $\alpha \in (0,1)$*,* $\tau > 0$ *and* $\alpha' \in (0, \frac{q}{2+q}]$*, and*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t>0} \int \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho|u|^2 + |\rho-\tilde\rho|^2 + \sigma|\nabla u|^2 \right) dx \\ & + \int_0^\infty \int \left(|\nabla u|^2 + \sigma|(\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u \otimes u)|^2 + \sigma^2 |\nabla \dot u|^2 \right) dx dt \\ \le \ & C(C_0+C_f)^\theta. \end{aligned} \tag{1.19}$$

In addition, in the case that $\inf \rho_0 > 0$*, the term* $\int_0^\infty \int \sigma |\dot u|^2 dx dt$ *may be included on the left hand side of (1.19).*

Remark 1.1. Here, θ is a universal positive constant (we choose $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ in this paper), ε and C depend on $\tilde\rho$, $\bar\rho_1$, $\bar\rho$, P, λ, μ, q and M.

Remark 1.2. For example, we can choose that $P = A\rho^\gamma$ and $\lambda(\rho) = c\rho^\beta$ with $\gamma \ge 1$ and $\beta \ge 2$, where A and c are two positive constants. Also, we can choose that λ is a positive constant and $P = A\rho^\gamma$ with $\gamma \ge 1$.

Remark 1.3. Considering the non-vacuum case, i.e., $\rho_0 \ge 2\underline{\rho} > 0$, we can replace the condition (1.6) by

$$\begin{cases} P \in C^1([0,\bar\rho]), \ \lambda \in C^2([\underline{\rho},\bar\rho]), \\ \mu > 0, \ \lambda(\rho) \ge 0, \ \rho \in [0,\bar\rho] \\ P(0) = 0, \ P'(\tilde\rho) > 0, \\ (\rho-\tilde\rho)[P(\rho)-P(\tilde\rho)] > 0, \ \rho \neq \tilde\rho, \ \rho \in [\underline{\rho},\bar\rho], \\ P \in C^2([\underline{\rho},\bar\rho]) \ \text{ or } \ \frac{P(\cdot)}{2\mu+\lambda(\cdot)} \ \text{ is a monotone function on } [\underline{\rho},\bar\rho], \end{cases} \tag{1.20}$$

where $0 \le 2\underline{\rho} < \tilde\rho < \bar\rho$. Then, we can choose that $P = A\rho^\gamma$ and $\lambda(\rho) = c\rho^\beta$ with $\gamma \ge 1$ and $\beta \ge 0$.

Remark 1.4. Using a similar argument as that in [16], one can obtain the uniqueness of the solution if the initial data satisfy $\rho_0 \geq \underline{\rho} > 0$, and $(\rho_0, u_0) \in C^{1+\alpha} \times C^{2+\alpha}$ or $(\rho_0, u_0) \in W^{1,q} \times H^2$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $q > 2$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 consists in the derivation of a priori estimates for smooth solutions corresponding to mollified initial data, and the application of these estimates in extracting limiting weak solutions as the mollifying parameter goes to zero. Specifically, in Section 2, we fix a smooth, local in time solution for which $0 \leq \rho \leq \overline{\rho}$ and $A_1 + A_2 \leq 2(C_0 + C_f)^\theta$, where $\theta \in (0, 1)$,

$$A_1(T) = \sup_{0<t\leq T} \sigma \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \sigma\rho|\dot{u}|^2 dxdt$$

and

$$A_2(T) = \sup_{0<t\leq T} \sigma^2 \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \sigma^2|\nabla\dot{u}|^2 dxdt,$$

then obtain the estimate $A_1 + A_2 \leq (C_0 + C_f)^\theta$, and prove that the density remains in a compact subset of $[0, \overline{\rho})$. Using the classical continuation method, we can close these estimates, which are then applied in Section 3 to show the solution can be obtained in the limit as the mollifying parameter goes to zero.

Using the initial condition $u_0 \in H^1$, we can obtain pointwise bounds for F in Proposition 2.6, which is the key point of the a priori estimates. Because that the mass equation can be transformed to the following form,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Lambda(\rho(x(t), t)) + P(\rho(x(t), t)) - P(\tilde{\rho}) = -F(x(t), t), \tag{1.21}$$

where Λ satisfies that $\Lambda(\tilde{\rho}) = 0$ and $\Lambda'(\rho) = \frac{2\mu+\lambda(\rho)}{\rho}$, a curve $x(t)$ satisfies $\dot{x}(t) = u(x(t), t)$, thus pointwise bounds for the density will therefore follow from pointwise bounds for F. On the other hand, using a similar argument as that in [16] and the estimate $\int_0^T \|F(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty} dt \leq C(T)$, we can obtain the strong limit of approximate densities $\{\rho^\delta\}$, see Section 3.

Then, we study the propagation of singularities in solutions obtained in Theorem 1.1. We show that each point of $\mathbb{R}^2$ determines a unique integral curve of the velocity field at the initial time $t = 0$, and that this system of integral curves defines a locally bi-Hölder homeomorphism of any open subset Ω onto its image Ω^t at each time $t > 0$. Using this Lagrangean structure, we show that if there is a vacuum domain at the initial time, then the vacuum domain will exist for all time, and vanishes as time goes to infinity, see Theorem 1.4. Also, we show that, if the initial density has a limit at a point from a given side of a continuous hypersurface, then at each later time both the density and the divergence of the velocity have limits at the transported point from the corresponding side of the transported hypersurface, which is also a continuous manifold. If the limits from both sides exist, then the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions hold in a strict pointwise sense, showing that the jump in the $(\lambda + 2\mu)\mathrm{div}u$ is proportional to the jump in the pressure. This leads to a derivation of an explicit representation for the strength of the jump in $\Lambda(\rho)$ in non-vacuum domain. These results generalize and improve upon the earlier results of Hoff-Santos [6] in a significant way: the domain may contain the vacuum states.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 hold.*

(1) *For each $t_0 \geq 0$ and each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, there is a unique curve $X(\cdot; x_0, t_0) \in C^1((0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2) \cap C^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, satisfying*

$$X(t; x_0, t_0) = x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t u(X(s; x_0, t_0), s)ds. \tag{1.22}$$

(2) *Denote $X(t, x_0) = X(t; x_0, 0)$. For each $t > 0$ and any open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\Omega^t = X(t, \cdot)\Omega$ is open and the map $x_0 \longmapsto X(t, x_0)$ is a homeomorphism of Ω onto Ω^t.*

(3) *For any $0 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq T$, the map $X(t_1, y) \to X(t_2, y)$ is Hölder continuous from $\mathbb{R}^2$ onto $\mathbb{R}^2$. Specifically, for any $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$|X(t_2, y_2) - X(t_2, y_1)| \leq \exp(1 - e^{-C(1+T)})|X(t_1, y_2) - X(t_1, y_1)|^{e^{-C(1+T)}}. \tag{1.23}$$

(4) *Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a C^α 1-manifold, where $\alpha \in [0,1)$. Then, for any $t > 0$, $\mathcal{M}^t = X(t,\cdot)\mathcal{M}$ is a C^β 1-manifold, where $\beta = \alpha e^{-C(1+t)}$.*

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Let V be a nonempty open set in $\mathbb{R}^2$. If $\mathrm{essinf}\rho_0|_V \geq \underline{\rho} > 0$, then there is a positive number $\underline{\rho}^-$ such that,*

$$\rho(\cdot,t)|_{V^t} \geq \underline{\rho}^-,$$

for all $t > 0$, where $V^t = X(t,\cdot)V$.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Let U be a nonempty open set in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Assume that $\rho_0|_U = 0$. Then,*

$$\rho(\cdot,t)|_{U^t} = 0,$$

for all $t > 0$, where $U^t = X(t,\cdot)U$. Furthermore, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \int |\rho - \tilde{\rho}|^4(x,t)dx = 0, \tag{1.24}$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} |\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 | \rho(x,t) = 0\}| = 0. \tag{1.25}$$

Theorems 1.2-1.4 are proved in Section 4.

In the following theorem, applying the Lagrangean structure of Theorem 1.2, we establish a result concerning the transport by the velocity field of pointwise continuity of the density. Recall first that the oscillation of g at x with respect to E is defined by (as in [6])

$$\mathrm{osc}(g; x, E) = \lim_{R\to 0} \left(\mathrm{esssup} g|_{E\cap B_R(x)} - \mathrm{essinf} g|_{E\cap B_R(x)} \right),$$

where $x \in \bar{E}$ and g maps an open set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ into $\mathbb{R}$. We shall say that g is continuous at an interior point x of E, if $\mathrm{osc}(g; x, E) = 0$.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open and $x_0 \in \bar{E}$. If $\mathrm{osc}(\rho_0; x_0, E) = 0$, then $\mathrm{osc}(\rho(\cdot,t); X(t,x_0), X(t,\cdot)E) = 0$. In particular, if $x_0 \in E$ and ρ_0 is continuous at x_0, then $\rho(\cdot,t)$ is continuous at $X(t,x_0)$.*

Now, let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C^0 1-manifold in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there is a neighborhood G of x_0 which is the disjoint union $G = (G \cap \mathcal{M}) \cup E_+ \cup E_-$, where $E_\pm$ are open and x_0 is a limit point of each. If $\mathrm{osc}(g; x_0, E_+) = 0$, then the common value $g(x_0+,t)$ is the one-sided limit of g at x_0 from the plus-side of $\mathcal{M}$, and similar for the one-sided limit $g(x_0-,t)$ from the minus-side of $\mathcal{M}$. If both of these limits exist, then the difference $[g(x_0)] := g(x_0+) - g(x_0-)$ is the jump in g at x_0 with respect to $\mathcal{M}$. (see [6])

Now, we state our main results on the propagation of singularities in solutions.

Theorem 1.6. *Let (ρ, u) as in Theorem 1.1, $\mathcal{M}$ be a C^0 1-manifold and $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$.*

(a) If ρ_0 has a one-sided limit at x_0 from the plus-side of $\mathcal{M}$, then for each $t > 0$, $\rho(\cdot,t)$ and $\mathrm{div}u(\cdot,t)$ have one-sided limits at $X(t,x_0)$ from the plus-side of the C^0 1-manifold $X(t,\cdot)\mathcal{M}$ corresponding to the choice $E_+^t = X(t,\cdot)E_+$. The map $t \mapsto \rho(X(t,x_0)+,t)$ is in $C^{\frac{3q}{4+4q}}([0,\infty)) \cap C^1((0,\infty))$ and the map $t \mapsto \mathrm{div}u(X(t,x_0)+,t)$ is locally Hölder continuous on $(0,\infty)$.

(b) If both one-sided limits $\rho_0(x_0\pm)$ of ρ_0 at x_0 with respect to $\mathcal{M}$ exist, then for each $t > 0$, the jumps in $P(\rho(\cdot,t))$ and $\mathrm{div}u(\cdot,t)$ at $X(t,x_0)$ satisfy the Rankine-Hugonoit condition

$$[(2\mu + \lambda(\rho(X(t,x_0),t)))\mathrm{div}u(X(t,x_0),t)] = [P(\rho(X(t,x_0),t))]. \tag{1.26}$$

(c) Furthermore, if $\rho_0(x_0\pm) \geq \underline{\rho} > 0$, then the jump in $\Lambda(\rho)$ satisfies the representation

$$[\Lambda(\rho(X(t,x_0),t))] = \exp\left(-\int_0^t a(\tau,x_0)d\tau\right)[\Lambda(\rho_0(x_0))] \tag{1.27}$$

where $a(t,x_0) = \frac{[P(\rho(X(t,x_0),t))]}{[\Lambda(\rho(X(t,x_0),t))]}$.

Theorems 1.5-1.6 are proved in Section 5.

Remark 1.5. From Theorems 1.2-1.6, we have that if $[\rho_0]$ is nonzero at x_0, then $[\rho(\cdot,t)]$ is nonzero at $X(t;x_0,0)$ for every $t>0$. That is, singularities of this type persist for all time. On the other hand, if $P'(\rho)>0$ with $\underline{\rho}^- \le \rho \le \overline{\rho}$, then a is strictly positive and the jump in $\Lambda(\rho)$ in the non-vacuum domain decays exponentially in time. Thus, the jumps in ρ, in $\frac{P(\rho)}{\lambda(\rho)+2\mu}$ and in div$u$ in the non-vacuum domain decay exponentially in time as well.

At last, we will show that the condition of μ =constant will induce a singularity of the system at vacuum in the following two aspects: 1) considering the special case where two fluid regions initially separated by a vacuum region, we show that the solution we obtained is a nonphysical weak solution in which separate kinetic energies of the two fluids need not to be conserved; 2) we show the blow-up of smooth solutions for the spherically symmetric system when the initial density is compactly supported. Thus, the viscosity coefficient μ plays a key role in the Navier-Stokes equations.

If we consider the special case where two fluid regions initially separated by a vacuum region, Theorem 1.4 shows that the solution obtained in Theorem 1.1 is a nonphysical weak solution in which the two fluids cannot collide independent of their initial velocities. In the following, we will show that the separate kinetic energies of the two fluids needn't to be conserved.

If the initial data are spherically symmetric, i.e,

$$\rho_0(x)=\varrho_0(r),\ u_0(x)=v_0(r)\frac{x}{r},\ r=|x|, \tag{1.28}$$

and the external force $f\equiv 0$, from Theorem 1.1, one can prove that the system (1.1)–(1.3) has a spherically symmetric solution (ρ,u) satisfying

$$\rho(x,t)=\varrho(r,t),\ u(x,t)=v(r,t)\frac{x}{r},\ r=|x|. \tag{1.29}$$

Then (ϱ,v) is a solution of the following system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\varrho+\partial_r(\varrho v)+\frac{1}{r}\varrho v=0,\\ \varrho(\partial_t v+v\partial_r v)+\partial_r P(\varrho)=\partial_r\{(\lambda(\varrho)+2\mu)(\partial_r v+\frac{v}{r})\}, \end{cases} \tag{1.30}$$

$$v(r,t)\to 0,\ \varrho(r,t)\to\tilde{\rho}>0,\quad \text{as } r\to\infty,\ t>0, \tag{1.31}$$

$$(\varrho,v)|_{t=0}=(\varrho_0,v_0). \tag{1.32}$$

Furthermore, assume that there are two positive constant $0<a<b$, such that

$$\varrho_0(r)=0,\ r\in(a,b),$$

and

$$\varrho_0(r)\ge\underline{\varrho}>0,\ r\in(0,a)\cup(b,+\infty).$$

Then, from Theorems 1.2-1.4, we have there are two curves $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ satisfying

$$0<a(t)<b(t)<\infty,$$

$$a(0)=a,\ a'(t)=v(a(t),t),\ b(0)=b,\ b'(t)=v(b(t),t),$$

$$\varrho(r,t)=0,\ r\in(a(t),b(t)),$$

and

$$\varrho(r,t)\ge\underline{\varrho}^->0,\ r\in(0,a(t))\cup(b(t),+\infty),$$

for some positive constant $\underline{\varrho}^-$. Using a similar argument as that in [10], we can obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1.7. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 hold, $\int_0^1 s^{-2}P(s)ds < \infty$, $f = 0$, and the initial data satisfy (1.28), then we have*

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = 2(\lambda(0) + 2\mu)a(t)v(a(t),t)\frac{a(t)v(a(t),t) - b(t)v(b(t),t)}{a^2(t) - b^2(t)},\ t \geq 0, \tag{1.33}$$

where

$$E(t) = \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\frac{1}{2}\varrho v^2 + \overline{G}(\varrho)\right) rdr + \int_0^t \int_0^{a(s)} (\lambda + 2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r})^2 rdrds,$$

and

$$\overline{G}(\rho) = \rho \int_0^\rho \frac{P(s)}{s^2}ds.$$

Remark 1.6. If the viscosity coefficient μ is a function of the density and $\lambda(0) = \mu(0) = 0$, the equality (1.33) implies the separate kinetic energies of the two fluids are conserved. Thus, the main reason for the appearance of non-physical solutions comes from the viscosity coefficient μ being independent of the density.

Remark 1.7. The physical solution of the (1.30)–(1.32) may be obtained by constructing separately the solutions for each of the fluids $\varrho_0|_{[0,a]}$ and $\varrho_0|_{[b,\infty)}$ with the boundary conditions

$$(\lambda(\varrho) + 2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r}) = P(\varrho),\ r = a(t),\ b(t). \tag{1.34}$$

When $a(t) < b(t)$, one can obtain the composite solution (ϱ, v). Observe that the kinetic energies are separately conserved because of the boundary conditions (1.34). When v_0 is large and positive on $[0, a]$, large and negative on $[b, \infty)$, a collision $a(t) = b(t)$ may occur in finite time.

Finally, in Section 7, we will give a non-global existence theorem on smooth solutions for the spherically symmetric system when the initial density is of compact support. The corresponding theorem on compressible Navier-Stokes equations with constant viscosity and heat conductivity coefficients was obtained in [17]. Here we generalize the above theorem to the case when the second viscosity coefficient depends on the density for the isentropic gas flow.

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose that $(\rho, u) \in C^1([0,T]; H^k)$, $k > 3$ is a spherically symmetric solution to the Cauchy problem (1.1) and (1.3) with $f = 0$. Assume that $P(\rho) = A\rho^\gamma$ and $\lambda(\rho) = c\rho^\beta$ with $1 < \beta \leq \gamma$ and $A, c > 0$. If the support of the initial density ρ_0 is compact and $\rho_0 \not\equiv 0$, then T must be finite.*

We now briefly review some previous works about the Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity coefficients. For the free boundary problem of one-dimensional or spherically symmetric isentropic fluids, there are many works, please see [5, 11, 14, 18, 19] and the references cited therein. Under a special condition between μ and λ, $\lambda = 2\rho\mu' - 2\mu$, there are some existence results of global weak solutions for the system with the Korteweg stress tensor or the additional quadratic friction term, see [1, 2]. H. L. Li, J. Li and Z. P. Xin [12] showed a very interesting result that for any global entropy weak solution of the one-dimensional system, any vacuum state must vanish within finite time. Also see Lions [13] for multidimensional isentropic fluids.

We should mention that the methods introduced by Hoff-Santos in [6], Hoff in [8] and Vaigant-Kazhikhov in [16] will play a crucial role in our proof here.

2 A priori estimates

In this section, we derive some a priori estimates for local smooth solutions of the system (1.1)–(1.3) with strictly positive densities. Thus, we fix a smooth solution (ρ, u) of (1.1)–(1.3) on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, T]$ for some time $T > 0$, with smooth initial data (ρ_0, u_0) and smooth external force f, satisfying

$$0 \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$A_1 + A_2 \leq 2(C_0 + C_f)^\theta. \tag{2.2}$$

In this paper, we choose $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ and assume that $\varepsilon \le 1$.

Before proceeding, we remark that a careful application of the standard Rankine-Hugoniot condition to (1.1) shows that discontinuities in ρ, $P(\rho)$ and ∇u across hypersurfaces can be expected to persist for all time, but that the functions F and w should be relatively smooth in positive time reflecting a cancellation of singularities (for example, see [6, 7, 8, 9]). We can rewrite the momentum equation in the form,

$$\rho \dot{u}^j = \partial_j F + \mu \partial_k w^{j,k} + \rho f^j. \tag{2.3}$$

Thus L^2 estimates for $\rho\dot{u}$, immediately imply L^2 hounds for ∇F and ∇w. Stated differently, the decomposition (2.3) implies that

$$\Delta F = \mathrm{div}(\rho\dot{u} - \rho f). \tag{2.4}$$

These two relations (2.3)–(2.4) will play the important role in this section.

Proposition 2.1. *There is a positive constant $C = C(\bar{\rho})$ such that, if (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) satisfying (2.1)–(2.2), then*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} \int \left[\frac{1}{2}\rho|u|^2 + G(\rho)\right] dx + \int_0^T \int |\nabla u|^2 dxdt \le C(C_0 + C_f). \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Using the energy estimate, we can easily obtain (2.5), and omit the details. ☐

The following lemma contains preliminary versions of L^2 bounds for ∇u and $\rho\dot{u}$.

Lemma 2.1. *If (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.1, then there is a constant $C = C(\bar{\rho})$ such that*

$$\sup_{0<t\le T} \sigma \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \sigma\rho|\dot{u}|^2 dxdt \le C\left(C_0 + C_f + O_1\right), \tag{2.6}$$

where $O_1 = \int_0^T \int \sigma|\nabla u|^3 dxdt$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0<t\le T} \sigma^2 \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \sigma^2 |\nabla\dot{u}|^2 dxdt \\ \le\; & C\left(C_0 + C_f + A_1(T)\right) + C\int_0^T \int \sigma^2(|u|^4 + |\nabla u|^4) dxdt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Multiplying $(1.1)_2$ by $\sigma\dot{u}$, integrating it over $\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,t]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \int \sigma\rho|\dot{u}|^2 dxds \\ =\; & \int_0^t \int \left(-\sigma\dot{u}\cdot\nabla P + \mu\sigma\Delta u\cdot\dot{u} + \sigma\nabla((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)\cdot\dot{u} + \sigma\rho f\cdot\dot{u}\right) dxds \\ :=\; & \sum_{i=1}^4 J_i. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Using the integration by parts and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 \;=\; & -\int_0^t \int \sigma\dot{u}\cdot\nabla P dxds \\ =\; & -\int_0^t \int \left(-\sigma(\mathrm{div}u)_t(P - P(\tilde{\rho})) + \sigma(u\cdot\nabla u)\cdot\nabla P\right) dxds \\ =\; & \int \sigma\mathrm{div}u(P - P(\tilde{\rho}))dx \\ & -\int_0^t \int \left(\sigma_t \mathrm{div}u(P - P(\tilde{\rho})) + \sigma P_t \mathrm{div}u + \sigma(u\cdot\nabla u)\cdot\nabla P\right) dxds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int \sigma \mathrm{div} u(P-P(\tilde{\rho}))dx - \int_0^t \int \{\sigma_t \mathrm{div} u(P-P(\tilde{\rho})) \\
&\quad +\sigma P' \left(-\rho(\mathrm{div} u)^2 - u\cdot\nabla\rho \mathrm{div} u + (u\cdot\nabla u)\cdot\nabla\rho\right)\} dxds \\
&= \int \sigma \mathrm{div} u(P-P(\tilde{\rho}))dx - \int_0^t \int \{\sigma_t \mathrm{div} u(P-P(\tilde{\rho})) \\
&\quad -\sigma P'\rho(\mathrm{div} u)^2 + \sigma P(\mathrm{div} u)^2 - \sigma P\partial_i u^j \partial_j u^i\} dxds \\
&\le C\left(\sigma\int|\nabla u||\rho-\tilde{\rho}|dx + \int_0^{1\wedge t}\int|\nabla u||\rho-\tilde{\rho}|dxds + \int_0^t\int|\nabla u|^2dxds\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= \int_0^t\int \sigma\mu\Delta u\cdot\dot{u}dxds \\
&= -\frac{\sigma\mu}{2}\int|\nabla u|^2dx + \frac{\mu}{2}\int_0^{1\wedge t}\int|\nabla u|^2dxds - \int_0^t\int\sigma\mu\partial_i u^j\partial_i(u^k\partial_k u^j)dxds \\
&\le -\frac{\sigma\mu}{2}\int|\nabla u|^2dx + \frac{\mu}{2}\int_0^{1\wedge t}\int|\nabla u|^2dxds + CO_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 &= \int_0^t\int\sigma\nabla((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div} u)\cdot\dot{u}dxds \\
&= -\frac{\sigma}{2}\int(\lambda+\mu)|\mathrm{div} u|^2dx + \int_0^t\int(\frac{\sigma}{2}\lambda'\rho_t|\mathrm{div} u|^2 + \frac{\sigma_t}{2}(\lambda+\mu)|\mathrm{div} u|^2)dxds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t\int\sigma\nabla((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div} u)\cdot(u\cdot\nabla u)dxds \\
&\le -\frac{\sigma}{2}\int(\lambda+\mu)|\mathrm{div} u|^2dx + \int_0^{1\wedge t}\int\frac{1}{2}(\lambda+\mu)|\mathrm{div} u|^2dxds + CO_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

$$J_4 = \int_0^t\int\sigma\rho f\cdot\dot{u}dxds \le \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int\sigma\rho|\dot{u}|^2dxds + C\int_0^t\int\sigma f^2dxds, \tag{2.12}$$

where $t\in[0,T]$. From (2.5), (2.8)–(2.12), we immediately obtain (2.6).

Takeing the operator $\partial_t + \mathrm{div}(u\cdot)$ in $(1.1)_2$, multiplying by $\sigma^2\dot{u}$ and integrating, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\int\rho|\dot{u}|^2dx \\
={}& \int_0^t\int\{\sigma\sigma'\rho|\dot{u}|^2 - \sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(\partial_j P u)] + \mu\sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\Delta u_t^j + \mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)] \\
&+\sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\partial_j\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div} u) + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div} u))] + \sigma^2\dot{u}^j[(\rho f^j)_t + \mathrm{div}(u\rho f^j)]\}dxds \\
:={}& \sum_{i=1}^5 K_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Using the integration by parts and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
K_2 &= -\int_0^t\int\sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(\partial_j P u)]dxds \\
&= \int_0^t\int\sigma^2[\partial_j\dot{u}^j P'\rho_t + \partial_k\dot{u}^j\partial_j P u^k]dxds \\
&= \int_0^t\int\sigma^2[-P'\rho\mathrm{div} u\partial_j\dot{u}^j + \partial_k(\partial_j\dot{u}^j u^k)P - P\partial_j(\partial_k\dot{u}^j u^k)]dxds \\
&\le C\left(\int_0^t\int|\nabla u|^2dxds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^t\int\sigma^2|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \quad C(C_0+C_f)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_0^t\int \sigma^2|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_3 \quad &= \quad \int_0^t\int \mu\sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\Delta u_t^j+\mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)]dxds \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\mu[\partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_i u_t^j+\Delta u^j u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}^j]dxds \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\mu[|\nabla\dot{u}|^2-\partial_i\dot{u}^j u^k\partial_k\partial_i u^j-\partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_i u^k\partial_k u^j+\Delta u^j u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}^j]dxds \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\mu[|\nabla\dot{u}|^2+\partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_k u^k\partial_i u^j-\partial_i\dot{u}^j\partial_i u^k\partial_k u^j-\partial_i u^j\partial_i u^k\partial_k\dot{u}^j]dxds \\
&\leq \quad -\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\mu|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds+C\int_0^t\int \sigma^2|\nabla u|^4dxds, \qquad (2.15)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_4 \quad &= \quad \int_0^t\int \sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\partial_j\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)+\mathrm{div}(u\partial_j((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u))]dxds \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int\{\sigma^2\partial_j\dot{u}^j[\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)+\mathrm{div}(u(\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)] \\
&\quad\quad +\sigma^2\dot{u}^j\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u(\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)\}dxds \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\partial_j\dot{u}^j[\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)+u^k\lambda'\partial_k\rho\mathrm{div}u+(\lambda+\mu)u^k\partial_k\mathrm{div}u]dxds+O_4 \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\partial_j\dot{u}^j[(\lambda+\mu)\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u+\lambda'\rho_t\mathrm{div}u+u^k\lambda'\partial_k\rho\mathrm{div}u]dxds+O_4 \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2\partial_j(\partial_t u^j+u\cdot\nabla u^j)(\lambda+\mu)\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}udxds+O_4 \\
&= \quad -\int_0^t\int \sigma^2(\lambda+\mu)|\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|^2dxds+O_4, \qquad (2.16)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_5 \quad &= \quad \int_0^t\int \sigma^2\dot{u}^j[(\rho f^j)_t+\mathrm{div}(u\rho f^j)]dxds \\
&= \quad \int_0^t\int \sigma^2\dot{u}^j[\rho f_t^j+\rho u\cdot\nabla f^j]dxds \\
&\leq \quad C\int_0^t\int[\sigma\rho|\dot{u}|^2+\sigma^2|u|^4+\sigma^4|\nabla f|^4+\sigma^3|f_t|^2]dxds, \qquad (2.17)
\end{aligned}$$

where O_4 denotes any term dominated by $C\int_0^t\int\sigma^2|\nabla u|^2(|\nabla\dot{u}|+|\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|)$, and $t\in[0,T]$. From (2.13)–(2.17), we immediately obtain (2.7). □

The following lemmas will be applied to bound the higher order terms occurring on the right hand sides of (2.6)–(2.7).

Lemma 2.2. *If (ρ,u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.1, then there is a constant $C=C(\bar{\rho})$ such that,*

$$\|u\|_{L^p}^p\leq C_p(C_0+C_f)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{p-2}+C_p(C_0+C_f)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^p,\ p\in[2,\infty), \tag{2.18}$$

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^p}\leq C_p(\|F\|_{L^p}+\|w\|_{L^p}+\|P-P(\tilde{\rho})\|_{L^p}),\ p\in(1,\infty), \tag{2.19}$$

$$\|\nabla F\|_{L^p}+\|\nabla w\|_{L^p}\leq C_p(\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^p}+\|f\|_{L^p}),\ p\in(1,\infty), \tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|F\|_{L^p}+\|w\|_{L^p} &\le C_p\big(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p-2}{p}}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}}+\|P-P(\tilde\rho)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}})\\ &\quad+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}+\|f\|_{L^2}+\|P-P(\tilde\rho)\|_{L^2}\big),\ p\in[2,\infty). \qquad (2.21)\end{aligned}$$

Also, for $0\le t_1\le t_2\le T$, $p\ge 2$ *and* $s\ge 0$,

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int\sigma^s|\rho-\tilde\rho|^p dxds\le C\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int\sigma^s|F|^p dxds+C_0+C_f\right). \qquad (2.22)$$

Proof. Using the Galiardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p}\le C_p\|u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p-2}{p}},\ p\in[2,\infty). \qquad (2.23)$$

Since

$$\tilde\rho\int|u|^2dx\le\int\rho|u|^2dx+\left(\int|\rho-\tilde\rho|^2dx\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int|u|^4dx\right)^{\frac12},$$

applying (2.23) and Proposition 2.1, we get

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2\le C(C_0+C_f)+C(C_0+C_f)^{\frac12}\|u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2\le C(C_0+C_f)+C(C_0+C_f)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Combining it with (2.23), we get (2.18).

Since $F=(\lambda+2\mu)\mathrm{div}u-P+P(\tilde\rho)$, we have

$$\Delta u^j=\partial_j\Big(\frac{F+P-P(\tilde\rho)}{\lambda+2\mu}\Big)+\partial_i(w^{j,i}). \qquad (2.24)$$

From the standard elliptic theory, we can get (2.19).

We compute from $(1.1)_2$ that

$$\mu\Delta w^{j,k}=\partial_k(\rho\dot u^j)-\partial_j(\rho\dot u^k)+\partial_j(\rho f^k)-\partial_k(\rho f^j).$$

Using the standard elliptic theory, we can get

$$\|\nabla w\|_{L^p}\le C_p(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^p}+\|f\|_{L^p}),\ p\in(1,\infty).$$

From (2.3), we have

$$\partial_jF=\rho\dot u^j-\mu\partial_k w^{j,k}-\rho f^j$$

and

$$\|\nabla F\|_{L^p}\le C(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^p}+\|\nabla w\|_{L^p}+\|f\|_{L^p}),\ p\in(1,\infty).$$

Thus, we can obtain (2.20).

From (2.20) with $p=2$ and (2.23), we can immediately obtain (2.21).

Multiplying the mass equation $(1.1)_1$ by $p\sigma^s|\rho-\tilde\rho|^{p-1}\mathrm{sgn}(\rho-\tilde\rho)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(\partial_t+\mathrm{div}(u\cdot))(\sigma^s|\rho-\tilde\rho|^p)+\frac{\sigma^s}{\lambda+2\mu}((p-1)\rho+\tilde\rho)|\rho-\tilde\rho|^{p-1}|P-P(\tilde\rho)|\\ =\ & s\sigma^{s-1}\sigma_t|\rho-\tilde\rho|^p-\frac{\sigma^s}{\lambda+2\mu}((p-1)\rho+\tilde\rho)\mathrm{sgn}(\rho-\tilde\rho)|\rho-\tilde\rho|^{p-1}F.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\sigma^s|\rho-\tilde\rho|^pdx\Big|_{t_1}^{t_2}+C^{-1}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int\sigma^s|\rho-\tilde\rho|^pdxds\\ \le\ & C\left(\int_{t_1}^{\sigma(t_2)\vee t_1}\int\sigma^{s-1}|\rho-\tilde\rho|^pdxds+\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int\sigma^s|F|^pdxds\right). \qquad (2.25)\end{aligned}$$

Using the result of Proposition 2.1, we can immediately get (2.22). □

Now, we apply the estimates of Lemma 2.2 to close the bounds in Lemma 2.1.

Proposition 2.2. *If (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.1, and ε is small enough, then we have*

$$\sup_{0<t\le T}\int\left(\sigma|\nabla u|^2+\sigma^2\rho|\dot u|^2\right)dx+\int_0^T\int\left(\sigma\rho|\dot u|^2+\sigma^2|\nabla\dot u|^2\right)dxdt\le (C_0+C_f)^\theta. \tag{2.26}$$

Proof. From Proposition 2.1 and Lemmas 2.1-2.2, we have

$$\text{LHS of (2.26)}\le C(C_0+C_f)+C\int_0^T\int\left(\sigma|\nabla u|^3+\sigma^2|u|^4+\sigma^2|\nabla u|^4\right)dxds. \tag{2.27}$$

From (2.19), we get

$$\int_0^T\int\sigma^2|\nabla u|^4dxds\le\int_0^T\int\sigma^2\left[|F|^4+|w|^4+|P-P(\tilde\rho)|^4\right]dxds. \tag{2.28}$$

From (2.5), (2.18) and (2.20)–(2.23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int\sigma^2|F|^4dxds\\
\le\;& C\int_0^T\sigma^2\left(\int|F|^2dx\right)\left(\int|\nabla F|^2dx\right)ds\\
\le\;& C\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int\sigma(|\nabla u|^2+|\rho-\tilde\rho|^2)dx\int_0^T\int\sigma\left(\rho|\dot u|^2+|f|^2\right)dxds\\
\le\;& C(A_1+C_0+C_f)^2,
\end{aligned}\tag{2.29}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int\sigma^2|w|^4dxds\\
\le\;& C\int_0^T\sigma^2\left(\int|w|^2dx\right)\left(\int|\nabla w|^2dx\right)ds\\
\le\;& C\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int\sigma|\nabla u|^2dx\int_0^T\int\sigma\left(\rho|\dot u|^2+|f|^2\right)dxds\\
\le\;& C(A_1+C_0+C_f)^2,
\end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T\int\sigma^2|\rho-\tilde\rho|^4dxds\;&\le\; C\left(\int_0^T\int\sigma^2|F|^4dxds+C_0+C_f\right)\\
&\le\; C(A_1+C_0+C_f)^2+C(C_0+C_f),
\end{aligned}\tag{2.31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T\int\sigma^2|u|^4dxds\;&\le\; C(C_0+C_f)\int_0^T\sigma^2\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4\right)ds\\
&\le\; CA_1(C_0+C_f)^2+C(C_0+C_f)^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.32}$$

From (2.28)–(2.32), we have

$$\int_0^T\int\sigma^2(|u|^4+|\nabla u|^4)dxds\le CA_1^2+C(C_0+C_f). \tag{2.33}$$

Similarly, we get

$$\int_0^T\int\sigma|\nabla u|^3dxds\;\le\;\int_0^T\int\left(\sigma^2|\nabla u|^4+|\nabla u|^2\right)dxds$$

$$\leq \quad CA_1^2 + C(C_0 + C_f). \tag{2.34}$$

Then, from (2.2), (2.27) and (2.33)–(2.34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (2.26)} \quad &\leq \quad C(C_0 + C_f) + CA_1^2 \\ &\leq \quad C(C_0 + C_f) + C(C_0 + C_f)^{2\theta} \\ &\leq \quad (C_0 + C_f)^{\theta}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

when

$$\varepsilon^{1-\theta} + \varepsilon^{\theta} \leq \frac{1}{2C}. \tag{2.36}$$

□

Then, we consider the Hölder continuity of u in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *When $t \in (0, T]$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$< u(\cdot, t) >^{\alpha} \leq C \left(\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\alpha} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha} + (C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}) + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + (C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \right). \tag{2.37}$$

Proof. Let $p = \frac{2}{1-\alpha}$. From (2.19), (2.21) and Sobolev's embedding theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &< u(\cdot, t) >^{\alpha} \\ \leq \quad & C\|\nabla u\|_{L^p} \\ \leq \quad & C(\|F\|_{L^p} + \|w\|_{L^p} + \|P - P(\tilde{\rho})\|_{L^p}) \\ \leq \quad & C \left(\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p-2}{p}} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}} + \|P - P(\tilde{\rho})\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}}) + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2} + \|P - P(\tilde{\rho})\|_{L^2} \right) \\ & + C\|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^{\infty}}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \\ \leq \quad & C \left(\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p-2}{p}} (\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}} + (C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{1}{p}}) + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + (C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.3. *If $u_0 \in H^1$, (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.1, then we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx dt \leq C(1 + M_q). \tag{2.38}$$

Proof. Using a similar argument as that in the proof of (2.6), we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx dt \leq C(C_0 + C_f + M_q) + C \int_0^T \int |\nabla u|^3 dx ds.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $T > 1$. From (2.26) and (2.34), we get

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx dt \leq C(1 + M_q) + C \int_0^1 \int |\nabla u|^3 dx ds.$$

From (2.19) and (2.22), we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \int_0^T \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx dt \leq C(1 + M_q) + C \int_0^1 \int (|F|^3 + |w|^3) dx ds.$$

From (2.20)–(2.21) and (2.23), we obtain

$$\int \left(|F|^3 + |w|^3 \right) dx$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le C\left(\int |F|^2dx\right)\left(\int |\nabla F|^2dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\left(\int |w|^2dx\right)\left(\int |\nabla w|^2dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\le C\int (|\nabla u|^2 + |\rho-\tilde{\rho}|^2)dx\left(\int \left(\rho|\dot{u}|^2+|f|^2\right)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \qquad (2.39)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, from Proposition 2.1, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int |\nabla u|^2dx + \int_0^T\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dxdt\\
\le\ & C(1+M_q) + C\int_0^1 \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + C_0 + C_f\right)\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2}\right)ds\\
\le\ & C(1+M_q) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dxdt + C\int_0^T \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^4ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$
\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int |\nabla u|^2dx + \int_0^T\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dxdt \le C(1+M_q)e^{\int_0^T\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2ds} \le C(1+M_q).
$$

□

Proposition 2.4. *If $u_0 \in H^1$, (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.1, then we have*

$$
\sup_{0<t\le T}\sigma\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dx + \int_0^T\int \sigma|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxdt \le C(1+M_q). \qquad (2.40)
$$

Proof. Using a similar argument as that in the proof of (2.7), from (2.38), we have

$$
\sup_{0<t\le T}\sigma\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dx + \int_0^T\int \sigma|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxdt \le C(1+M_q) + C\int_0^T\int \sigma\left(|u|^4 + |\nabla u|^4\right)dxds.
$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $T > 1$. From (2.26) and (2.33), we get

$$
\sup_{0<t\le T}\sigma\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dx + \int_0^T\int \sigma|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxdt \le C(1+M_q) + C\int_0^1\int \sigma\left(|u|^4 + |\nabla u|^4\right)dxds.
$$

From (2.5), (2.18)–(2.19), (2.22) and (2.38), we have

$$
\sup_{0<t\le T}\sigma\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dx + \int_0^T\int \sigma|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxdt \le C(M_q) + C\int_0^1\int \sigma(|F|^4 + |w|^4)dxds.
$$

From (2.5), (2.20), (2.23) and (2.38), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1\int \sigma\left(|F|^4 + |w|^4\right)dxds\\
\le\ & C\int_0^1\sigma\left(\int |F|^2dx\right)\left(\int |\nabla F|^2dx\right)ds + C\int_0^1\sigma\left(\int |w|^2dx\right)\left(\int |\nabla w|^2dx\right)ds\\
\le\ & C\int_0^1\sigma\left(\int (|\nabla u|^2 + |\rho-\tilde{\rho}|^2)dx\right)\left(\int \left(\rho|\dot{u}|^2 + |f|^2\right)dx\right)ds\\
\le\ & C(1+M_q) + \int_0^1\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\sigma\int \rho|\dot{u}|^2dxds. \qquad (2.41)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Gronwall's inequality, we can finish the proof of this proposition. □

Lemma 2.4. *For any* $p \in [2,\infty)$, *we have*

$$\|\dot{u}\|_{L^p} \le C_p \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}} \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} + C_p\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.42}$$

Proof. Since

$$\tilde{\rho}\int |\dot{u}|^2 dx \le \int \rho|\dot{u}|^2 dx + \left(\int |\rho-\tilde{\rho}|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\dot{u}|^4 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

applying (2.23) and Proposition 2.4, we get

$$\|\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \le C\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

From (2.23), we can immediately obtain (2.42). □

Lemma 2.5. *For any* $q \in (0,2)$, *we have*

$$\int_0^T\int \sigma^{\frac{2+q}{2}}\rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q} dxds \le C(1+M_q^{1+\frac{q}{2}}). \tag{2.43}$$

Proof. Let $p = \frac{4}{2-q}$. Using Hölder's inequality, (2.40) and (2.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int \sigma^{\frac{2+q}{2}}\rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q} dxds\\
\le\ & C\int_0^T \sigma^{\frac{2+q}{2}} \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(p-2-q)}{p-2}} \|\dot{u}\|_{L^p}^{\frac{qp}{p-2}} ds\\
\le\ & C\int_0^T \sigma^{\frac{2+q}{2}} \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2(p-2-q)}{p-2}} \left(\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2}{p}}\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{2}{p}} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)^{\frac{qp}{p-2}} ds\\
\le\ & C\left(\int_0^T \sigma\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt\right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \left(\int_0^T \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt\right)^{\frac{2-q}{2}} \left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \sigma\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}\\
&+C\left(\int_0^T \sigma\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt\right)^{\frac{qp}{2(p-2)}} \left(\int_0^T \|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt\right)^{\frac{2p-4-qp}{2(p-2)}} \left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \sigma\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}\\
\le\ & C(1+M_q^{1+\frac{q}{2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.5. *If* $u_0 \in H^1$, (ρ, u) *is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.4,* $q \in (0,2)$ *and*

$$q^2 < \frac{4\mu}{\lambda(\rho)+\mu},\ \forall\ \rho \in [0,\bar{\rho}], \tag{2.44}$$

then we have

$$\sup_{0<t\le T} \sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\int \rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q}dx + \int_0^T\int \sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|^2 dxdt \le C(M_q). \tag{2.45}$$

Proof. Using a similar argument as that in the proof of (2.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2+q}\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\int \rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q}dx\\
=\ & \int_0^t\int \{\frac{4+q}{4+2q}\sigma^{1+\frac{q}{2}}\sigma'\rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q} - \sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\left(\partial_j P_t + \mathrm{div}(\partial_j P u)\right)\\
&+\mu\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\left(\Delta u_t^j + \mathrm{div}(u\Delta u^j)\right)\\
&+\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\left(\partial_j\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u) + \mathrm{div}(u\partial_j((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u))\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad +\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\left((\rho f^j)_t+\operatorname{div}(u\rho f^j)\right)\}dxds\\
:=&\quad \sum_{i=1}^{5}H_i.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.46}
$$

Using the integration by parts and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_2 \;=\;& -\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\left(\partial_jP_t+\operatorname{div}(\partial_jPu)\right)dxds\\
=\;& \int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\left(\partial_j\dot{u}^jP'\rho_t+\partial_k\dot{u}^j\partial_jPu^k\right)dxds\\
&+\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^jP'\rho_t+\partial_k|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\partial_jPu^k\right)dxds\\
=\;& \int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(-|\dot{u}|^qP'\rho\operatorname{div}u\partial_j\dot{u}^j+\partial_k(|\dot{u}|^q\partial_j\dot{u}^ju^k)P-P\partial_j(|\dot{u}|^q\partial_k\dot{u}^ju^k)\right)dxds\\
&+\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(-\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^jP'\rho\operatorname{div}u+P\partial_k(\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^ju^k)-P\partial_j(\partial_k|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^ju^k)\right)dxds\\
=\;& \int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(-|\dot{u}|^qP'\partial_j\dot{u}^j\rho\operatorname{div}u+P\partial_k|\dot{u}|^q\partial_j\dot{u}^ju^k+P|\dot{u}|^q\partial_j\dot{u}^j\operatorname{div}u\right.\\
&-P\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\partial_k\dot{u}^ju^k-P|\dot{u}|^q\partial_k\dot{u}^j\partial_ju^k-\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^jP'\rho\operatorname{div}u\\
&\left.+P\partial_k(\dot{u}^ju^k)\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q-P\partial_j(\dot{u}^ju^k)\partial_k|\dot{u}|^q\right)dxds\\
=\;& \int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\big(-|\dot{u}|^qP'\partial_j\dot{u}^j\rho\operatorname{div}u+P|\dot{u}|^q\partial_j\dot{u}^j\operatorname{div}u-P|\dot{u}|^q\partial_k\dot{u}^j\partial_ju^k\\
&-\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^jP'\rho\operatorname{div}u+P\dot{u}^j\operatorname{div}u\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q-P\dot{u}^j\partial_ju^k\partial_k|\dot{u}|^q\big)dxds\\
\le\;& C\int_0^T\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\nabla\dot{u}||\dot{u}|^q|\nabla u|dxds,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.47}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_3 \;=\;& \int_0^t\int\mu\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\Big(\Delta u_t^j+\operatorname{div}(u\Delta u^j)\Big)dxds\\
=\;& -\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\mu\Big(\partial_i(|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j)\partial_iu_t^j+\Delta u^ju\cdot\nabla(|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j)\Big)dxds\\
=\;& -\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\mu\Big(|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|^2-\partial_i\dot{u}^ju^k\partial_k\partial_iu^j|\dot{u}|^q-\partial_i\dot{u}^j|\dot{u}|^q\partial_iu^k\partial_ku^j\\
&+\partial_i|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\partial_iu_t^j+\Delta u^ju\cdot\nabla(|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j)\Big)dxds\\
=\;& -\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\mu\big(|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|^2+\partial_i\dot{u}^j\operatorname{div}u\partial_iu^j|\dot{u}|^q+\partial_i|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\operatorname{div}u\partial_iu^j\\
&-\partial_i\dot{u}^j|\dot{u}|^q\partial_iu^k\partial_ku^j+\partial_i|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\partial_i\dot{u}^j-\partial_i|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\partial_iu^k\partial_ku^j\\
&-\partial_iu^j\partial_iu^k\partial_k|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j-\partial_iu^j|\dot{u}|^q\partial_iu^k\partial_k\dot{u}^j\big)dxds\\
\le\;& -\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\mu|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxds-\int_0^t\int\frac{q}{4}\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\mu|\dot{u}|^{q-2}|\nabla|\dot{u}|^2|^2dxds\\
&+C\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\nabla u|^2|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|dxds,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.48}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_4 \;=\;& \int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\left(\partial_j\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\operatorname{div}u)+\operatorname{div}(u\partial_j((\lambda+\mu)\operatorname{div}u))\right)dxds\\
=\;& \int_0^t\int\{-\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\partial_j(|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j)\left(\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\operatorname{div}u)+\operatorname{div}(u(\lambda+\mu)\operatorname{div}u)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u(\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)\}dxds\\
=&\int_0^t\int-\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\partial_j(|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j)\big(\partial_t((\lambda+\mu)\mathrm{div}u)\\
&+u^k\lambda'\partial_k\rho\mathrm{div}u+(\lambda+\mu)u^k\partial_k\mathrm{div}u\big)dxds+O_5\\
=&\int_0^t\int-\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\partial_j(|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j)\left((\lambda+\mu)\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u+\lambda'\rho_t\mathrm{div}u+u^k\lambda'\partial_k\rho\mathrm{div}u\right)dxds+O_5\\
=&-\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\partial_j(\partial_t u^j+u\cdot\nabla u^j)(\lambda+\mu)\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}udxds+O_5\\
&-\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\partial_j|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j(\lambda+\mu)\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}udxds\\
\leq&-\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}(\lambda+\mu)|\dot{u}|^q\left|\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u\right|^2dxds+O_5\\
&+\int_0^t\int q\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}(\lambda+\mu)|\dot{u}|^q\left|\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u\right||\nabla\dot{u}|dxds,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.49}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_5=&\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j[(\rho f^j)_t+\mathrm{div}(u\rho f^j)]dxds\\
=&\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q\dot{u}^j[\rho f^j_t+\rho u\cdot\nabla f^j]dxds\\
\leq&\,C\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(\rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q}+|f_t|^{2+q}+|u|^{4+2q}+|\nabla f|^{4+2q}\right)dxds,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.50}
$$

where O_5 denotes any term dominated by $C\int_0^t\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla u|^2(|\nabla\dot{u}|+|\frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u|)dxds$, and $t\in[0,T]$. From (2.18)–(2.19), (2.21)–(2.22), (2.38), (2.40), (2.42)–(2.44) and (2.46)–(2.50), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0<t\leq T}\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\int\rho|\dot{u}|^{2+q}dx+\int_0^T\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla\dot{u}|^2dxdt\\
\leq&\,C(M_q)+C\int_0^T\int\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla u|^4+|\dot{u}|^q|\nabla u|^2+|u|^{4+2q}\right)dxds\\
\leq&\,C(M_q)+C\left(\int_0^T\sigma\|\dot{u}\|^2_{L^{4+q}}ds\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}\left(\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\|\nabla u\|^{\frac{8}{2-q}}_{L^{4+q}}ds\right)^{\frac{2-q}{2}}+C\left(\int_0^T\sigma\|\dot{u}\|^2_{L^{4+q}}ds\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}\\
&\times\left(\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\|\nabla u\|^{\frac{8}{2-q}}_{L^{4+q}}ds\right)^{\frac{q(2-q)}{4(2+q)}}\left(\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{8+4q}{4-q^2}}\|\nabla u\|^{\frac{16}{(2-q)(4+q)}}_{L^2}ds\right)^{\frac{(2-q)(4+q)}{4(2+q)}}\\
&+C\int_0^T\sigma^{2+\frac{q}{2}}\left(\|\nabla u\|^{2+2q}_{L^2}+\|\nabla u\|^{4+2q}_{L^2}\right)dt\\
\leq&\,C(M_q)+C\int_0^T\sigma\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}\|^{\frac{4}{4+q}}_{L^2}\|\nabla\dot{u}\|^{\frac{2(2+q)}{4+q}}_{L^2}+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|^2_{L^2}\right)dt\\
&+C\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\left(\|F\|_{L^{4+q}}+\|w\|_{L^{4+q}}+\|\rho-\tilde{\rho}\|_{L^{4+q}}\right)^{\frac{8}{2-q}}ds\\
\leq&\,C(M_q)+C\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\left(\|F\|_{L^{4+q}}+\|w\|_{L^{4+q}}\right)^{\frac{8}{2-q}}ds+C\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\|\rho-\tilde{\rho}\|^{4+q}_{L^{4+q}}ds\\
\leq&\,C(M_q)+C\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\left(\|F\|^{\frac{2}{4+q}}_{L^2}\|\nabla F\|^{\frac{2+q}{4+q}}_{L^2}+\|w\|^{\frac{2}{4+q}}_{L^2}\|\nabla w\|^{\frac{2+q}{4+q}}_{L^2}\right)^{\frac{8}{2-q}}ds\\
&+C\int_0^T\sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}\|F\|^{4+q}_{L^{4+q}}ds
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le C(M_q) + C\int_0^T \sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\rho-\tilde\rho\|_{L^2})^{\frac{16}{(4+q)(2-q)}}(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2})^{\frac{8(2+q)}{(4+q)(2-q)}}ds \\
&\quad + C\int_0^T \sigma^{\frac{4}{2-q}}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\rho-\tilde\rho\|_{L^2})^2(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^2})^{2+q}ds \\
&\le C(M_q).
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Proposition 2.6. *If $f \in L_t^\infty L_x^{2+q}$, (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) as in Proposition 2.5, then we have*

$$
\|F\|_{L^\infty} + \|w\|_{L^\infty} \le C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\rho-\tilde\rho\|_{L^2})^{\frac{q}{2+2q}}(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^{2+q}} + \|f\|_{L^{2+q}})^{\frac{2+q}{2+2q}} \tag{2.51}
$$

and

$$
\int_0^T (\|F\|_{L^\infty} + \|w\|_{L^\infty})ds \le C(M_q)(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}}(1+T). \tag{2.52}
$$

Proof. From (2.5), (2.20), (2.26), (2.45) and the Galiardo-Nirenberg inequality, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|F\|_{L^\infty} \\
\le\ & C\|F\|_{L^2}^{\frac{q}{2+2q}}\|\nabla F\|_{L^{2+q}}^{\frac{2+q}{2+2q}} \\
\le\ & C(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\rho-\tilde\rho\|_{L^2})^{\frac{q}{2+2q}}(\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^{2+q}} + \|f\|_{L^{2+q}})^{\frac{2+q}{2+2q}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \|F\|_{L^\infty}ds \\
\le\ & C(M_q)\int_0^T (\sigma^{-\frac12}(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{\theta}{2}})^{\frac{q}{2+2q}}(\sigma^{-\frac{4+q}{4+2q}})^{\frac{2+q}{2+2q}}ds \\
\le\ & C(M_q)(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}}\int_0^T \sigma^{-\frac{2+q}{2+2q}}ds \le C(M_q)(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}}(1+T).
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, we can obtain the same estimates for w. □

Then, we derive a priori pointwise bounds for the density ρ.

Proposition 2.7. *Given numbers $0 < \underline{\rho}_2 < \underline{\rho}_1 < \tilde\rho < \bar\rho_1 < \bar\rho_2 < \bar\rho$, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, if (ρ, u) is a smooth solution of (1.1)–(1.3) with $C_0 + C_f \le \varepsilon$ and $0 < \rho_0 \le \bar\rho_1$, then*

$$
0 < \rho \le \bar\rho_2,\ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,T]. \tag{2.53}
$$

Similarly, if $\rho_0 \ge \underline{\rho}_1$ for all x, then $\rho \ge \underline{\rho}_2$ for all x and t. Furthermore, the estimates in Propositions 2.1-2.6 hold.

Proof. At first, we prove that if (2.1) and (2.2) hold, then estimate (2.53) holds.

We fix a curve $x(t)$ satisfying $\dot x = u(x(t),t)$ and $x(0) = x$. From (1.21), we have

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\Lambda(\rho(x(t),t)) + P(\rho(x(t),t)) - P(\tilde\rho) = -F(x(t),t), \tag{2.54}
$$

where Λ satisfies that $\Lambda(1) = 0$ and $\Lambda'(\rho) = \frac{2\mu+\lambda(\rho)}{\rho}$.

First for small time, we estimate the pointwise bounds of the density as follows. From (2.1) and (2.52), we have, for all $t \in [0,1]$,

$$
|\Lambda(\rho(x(t),t)) - \Lambda(\rho_0(x))| \le C(M_q)(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}} + Ct.
$$

When

$$
2C(M_q)\varepsilon^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}} \le \Lambda(\bar\rho_1 + \frac13(\bar\rho_2 - \bar\rho_1)) - \Lambda(\bar\rho_1), \tag{2.55}
$$

we get

$$\Lambda(\rho(x(t),t)) \le \Lambda(\bar\rho_1 + \frac{1}{3}(\bar\rho_2 - \bar\rho_1)), \quad t \in [0,\tau],$$

and

$$\rho(x,t) \le \bar\rho_1 + \frac{1}{3}(\bar\rho_2 - \bar\rho_1), \ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,\tau], \tag{2.56}$$

where $\tau = \min\{1, \frac{1}{2C}(\Lambda(\bar\rho_1 + \frac{1}{3}(\bar\rho_2 - \bar\rho_1)) - \Lambda(\bar\rho_1))$. Since $\rho_0 > 0$, then we have

$$\Lambda(\rho(x(t),t)) \ge \Lambda(\rho_0(x)) - C(M_q)(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}} - C\tau > -\infty, \ t \in [0,\tau],$$

and

$$\rho > 0, \ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,\tau].$$

Similarly, if $\rho_0 \ge \underline{\rho}_1$ and

$$2C(M_q)\varepsilon^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}} \le \Lambda(\underline{\rho}_1) - \Lambda(\underline{\rho}_1 - \frac{1}{3}(\underline{\rho}_1 - \underline{\rho}_2)), \tag{2.57}$$

we get

$$\rho \ge \underline{\rho}_1 - \frac{1}{3}(\underline{\rho}_1 - \underline{\rho}_2), \ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,\tau_1]. \tag{2.58}$$

where $\tau_1 = \min\{\tau, \frac{1}{2C}(\Lambda(\underline{\rho}_1) - \Lambda(\underline{\rho}_1 - \frac{1}{3}(\underline{\rho}_1 - \underline{\rho}_2)))\}$.

Then, for large time $t \ge \tau$, we estimate the pointwise bounds of density as follows. From (2.5), (2.26), (2.45), (2.51) and (2.54), we have

$$\frac{d\Lambda(\rho(x(t),t))}{dt} + P(\rho(x(t),t)) - P(\tilde\rho) = O_5(t), \tag{2.59}$$

where

$$|O_5(t)| \le C(\tau, M_q)(C_0 + C_f)^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}}, \ t \ge \tau.$$

Now, we apply a standard maximum principle argument to estimate the upper bounds of density. Let

$$t_0 = \max\{t \in (\tau, T] | \Lambda(\rho(x(s),s)) \le \Lambda(\bar\rho_2), \quad \text{for all } s \in [0,t]\}.$$

If $t_0 < T$, we have

$$\Lambda(\rho(x(t_0),t_0)) = \Lambda(\bar\rho_2),$$
$$\left.\frac{d\Lambda(\rho(x(t),t))}{dt}\right|_{t=t_0} \ge 0,$$

and

$$\rho(x(t_0),t_0) = \bar\rho_2.$$

From (2.59), we have

$$O_5(t_0) \ge P(\bar\rho_2) - P(\tilde\rho).$$

On the other hand, when

$$C(\tau, M_q)\varepsilon^{\frac{q\theta}{4+4q}} < P(\bar\rho_2) - P(\tilde\rho), \tag{2.60}$$

we have

$$O_5(t_0) < P(\bar\rho_2) - P(\tilde\rho).$$

It is a contradiction. Thus, we have $t_0 = T$ and

$$\rho \le \bar\rho_2, \ (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,T]. \tag{2.61}$$

Similarly, we can obtain the lower bound of the density.

Using the classical continuation method, (2.26) and (2.53), we can finish the proof of this proposition. □

Then, we can prove the global existence of smooth solutions to (1.1)–(1.3).

Proposition 2.8. *Assume that* $\rho_0 - \tilde{\rho} \in W^{1,p} \cap C^{1+\alpha}$, $u_0 \in H^2 \cap C^{2+\alpha}$, $p > 2$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\rho_0(x) \geq \underline{\rho}$ *with some* $\underline{\rho} > 0$ *for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $P, \lambda \in C^\infty([0,\bar{\rho}])$ *and* $f \in C^\infty([0,\infty); C^\infty)$. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, then there exists a solution* $(\rho, u) \in C^{1+\alpha, 1+\alpha/2} \times C^{2+\alpha,1+\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times [0,T])$ *satisfying (1.1)–(1.3) and for which the bound estimates of Propositions 2.1-2.7 hold, for all* $T > 0$.

Proof. Using similar arguments as that in [16] and in the proof of Proposition 3.2 in [8], one can obtain this proposition. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $j_\delta(x)$ be a standard mollifying kernel of width δ. Define the approximate initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta)$ by

$$\rho_0^\delta = j_\delta * \rho_0 + \delta,\ u_0^\delta = j_\delta * u_0.$$

Assuming that similar smooth approximations have been constructed for functions P, f and λ, we may then apply Proposition 2.8 to obtain a global smooth solution (ρ^δ, u^δ) of (1.1)–(1.3) with the initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, u_0^\delta)$, satisfying the bound estimates of Propositions 2.1-2.6 hold with constants independent of δ.

First, we obtain the strong limit of $\{u^\delta\}$. From (2.26) and (2.37), we have

$$< u^\delta(\cdot,t) >^\alpha \leq C(\tau), \quad t \geq \tau > 0,\ \alpha \in (0,1). \tag{3.1}$$

From (3.1), we have

$$\left| u^\delta(x,t) - \frac{1}{|B_R(x)|}\int_{B_R(x)} u^\delta(y,t)dy \right| \leq C(\tau)R^\alpha,\ t \geq \tau > 0.$$

Taking $R = 1$, from (2.18) and (2.26), we have

$$\|u^\delta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,\infty))} \leq C(\tau). \tag{3.2}$$

Then, we need only to derive a modulus of Hölder continuity in time. For all $t_2 \geq t_1 \geq \tau$, from (2.5), (2.26), (2.42) and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |u^\delta(x,t_2) - u^\delta(x,t_1)| \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{|B_R(x)|}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_{B_R(x)} |u_t^\delta(y,s)|dyds + C(\tau)R^\alpha \\
\leq\ & CR^{-1}|t_2-t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int |u_t^\delta|^2 dyds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(\tau)R^\alpha \\
\leq\ & CR^{-1}|t_2-t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int |\dot{u}^\delta|^2 + |u^\delta\cdot\nabla u^\delta|^2 dyds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(\tau)R^\alpha \\
\leq\ & C(\tau)(R^{-1}|t_2-t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} + R^\alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $R = |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{2+2\alpha}}$, we have

$$< u^\delta >^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2+2\alpha}}_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,\infty)} \leq C(\tau),\ \tau > 0. \tag{3.3}$$

From the Ascoli-Arzela theorem, we have (extract a subsequence)

$$u^\delta \to u, \text{ uniformly on compact sets in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,\infty). \tag{3.4}$$

Second, we obtain the strong limits of $\{F^\delta\}$ and $\{w^\delta\}$. From (2.20)–(2.21), (2.26) and (2.45), using similar arguments as that in the proof of (3.1)–(3.2), we have

$$< F^\delta(\cdot,t) >^{\alpha'} + \|F^\delta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T])} + < w^\delta(\cdot,t) >^{\alpha'} + \|w^\delta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T])} \leq C(\tau,T), \tag{3.5}$$

where $0 < \tau \le t \le T$ and $\alpha' \in (0, \frac{q}{2+q}]$. The simple computation implies that

$$\begin{aligned} F_t^\delta &= \rho^\delta(2\mu+\lambda(\rho^\delta))\left(F^\delta \frac{d}{ds}\left(\frac{1}{2\mu+\lambda(s)}\right)\bigg|_{s=\rho^\delta} + \frac{d}{ds}\left(\frac{P(s)-P(\tilde{\rho})}{2\mu+\lambda(s)}\right)\bigg|_{s=\rho^\delta}\right)\mathrm{div}u^\delta \\ &\quad -u^\delta\cdot\nabla F^\delta + (2\mu+\lambda(\rho^\delta))\mathrm{div}\dot{u}^\delta - (2\mu+\lambda(\rho^\delta))\partial_i u_j^\delta \partial_j u_i^\delta \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$(w^\delta)_t^{k,j} = -u^\delta\cdot\nabla(w^\delta)^{k,j} + \partial_j\dot{u}_k^\delta - \partial_k\dot{u}_j^\delta - \partial_j u_i^\delta\partial_i u_k^\delta + \partial_k u_i^\delta \partial_i u_j^\delta. \tag{3.7}$$

Then, from (2.20), (2.26), (2.33), (3.2) and (3.5), we have

$$\|F_t^\delta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T])} + \|w_t^\delta\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T])} \le C(\tau,T),\ T>\tau>0.$$

Using a similar argument as that in the proof of (3.3), we obtain

$$< F^\delta >^{\alpha',\frac{\alpha'}{2+2\alpha'}}_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T]} + < w^\delta >^{\alpha',\frac{\alpha'}{2+2\alpha'}}_{\mathbb{R}^2\times[\tau,T]} \le C(\tau,T),\ T>\tau>0. \tag{3.8}$$

and (extract a subsequence)

$$F^\delta \to F,\ w^\delta \to w,\ \text{uniformly on compact sets in } \mathbb{R}^2\times(0,\infty). \tag{3.9}$$

Third, we obtain the strong limit of $\{\rho^\delta\}$. From (2.53), we get (extract a subsequence)

$$\rho^\delta \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \rho, \quad \text{weak-* in} \quad L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Let $\Phi(s)$ be an arbitrary continuous function on $[0,\bar{\rho}]$. Then, we have that (extract a subsequence) $\Phi(\rho^\delta)$ converges weak-$*$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Denote the weak-$*$ limit by $\bar{\Phi}$:

$$\Phi(\rho^\delta) \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \bar{\Phi}, \quad \text{weak-* in} \quad L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

From the definition of F, we have

$$\mathrm{div}u = \bar{\nu}F + \overline{P_0}, \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$\nu(\rho) = \frac{1}{2\mu+\lambda(\rho)},\ P_0(\rho) = \nu(\rho)(P(\rho)-P(\tilde{\rho})).$$

From (1.1), we have

$$\partial_t\overline{\rho\ln\rho} + \mathrm{div}(\overline{\rho\ln\rho}u) + F\overline{\rho\nu} + \overline{\rho P_0} = 0$$

and

$$\partial_t(\rho\ln\rho) + \mathrm{div}(\rho\ln\rho u) + F\rho\overline{\nu} + \rho\overline{P_0} = 0.$$

Letting $\Psi = \overline{\rho\ln\rho} - \rho\ln\rho \ge 0$, we obtain

$$\partial_t\Psi + +\mathrm{div}(\Psi u) + F(\overline{\rho\nu} - \rho\nu) + F\rho(\nu - \bar{\nu}) + \overline{\rho P_0} - \rho\overline{P_0} = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

with the initial condition $\Psi|_{t=0} = 0$ almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let $\phi(s) = s\ln s$. Since

$$\phi''(s) = \frac{1}{s} \ge \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}},\ s\in[0,\bar{\rho}],$$

we get

$$\phi(\rho^\delta) - \phi(\rho) = \phi'(\rho)(\rho^\delta-\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\phi''(\rho+\xi(\rho^\delta-\rho))(\rho^\delta-\rho)^2,\ \xi\in[0,1],$$

and

$$\overline{\lim_{\delta\to 0}}\|\rho^\delta-\rho\|_{L^2}^2 \le C\|\Psi\|_{L^1}. \tag{3.12}$$

Similarly, every function $f \in C^2([0,\bar{\rho}])$ satisfies

$$\left|\int g(\bar{f} - f(\rho))dx\right| \le C\int |g|\Psi dx, \tag{3.13}$$

where g is any function such that the integrations exist. Then, when $\nu \in C^2([0,\bar{\rho}])$, we have

$$\left|\int F(\overline{\rho\nu} - \rho\nu)dx\right| \le C\int |F|\Psi dx \tag{3.14}$$

and

$$\left|\int F\rho(\bar{\nu} - \nu)dx\right| \le C\int |F|\Psi dx. \tag{3.15}$$

When $P_0 \in C^2([0,\bar{\rho}])$, we have

$$\left|\int(\overline{\rho P_0} - \rho\overline{P_0})dx\right| \le \left|\int(\overline{\rho P_0} - \rho P_0)dx\right| + \left|\int \rho(\overline{P_0} - P_0)dx\right| \le C\int \Psi dx. \tag{3.16}$$

When P_0 is monotone function on $[0,\bar{\rho}]$, using the Lemma 5 in [16], we have

$$\overline{\rho P_0} \ge \rho\overline{P_0}. \tag{3.17}$$

From (3.11)–(3.17), we obtain

$$\int \Psi dx \le \int_0^t\int(1+|F|)\Psi dxds.$$

Using (2.52) and Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\Psi = 0,\ (t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2,$$

and (extract a subsequence)

$$\rho^\delta - \tilde{\rho} \to \rho - \tilde{\rho},\ \text{ strongly in } L^k(\mathbb{R}^2\times[0,\infty)),$$

for all $k \in [2,\infty)$.

Thus, It is easy to show that the limit function (ρ,u) are indeed a weak solution of the system (1.1)–(1.3). This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1. ☐

4 Lagrangean Structure

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

(1). Here, we consider the case $t_0 = 0$. The proof of the case $t > 0$ is similar, and omit the details. We denote that $X(t,x_0) = X(t;x_0,0)$.

To prove the existence of the integral curve $X(\cdot,x_0)$, we first assume that $X^\delta(\cdot,x_0)$ is the corresponding integral curve of u^δ with initial point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$X^\delta(t,x_0) = x_0 + \int_0^t u^\delta(X^\delta(s,x_0),s)ds,\ s \in [0,\infty). \tag{4.1}$$

From (2.18), (2.37)–(2.38) and (2.40), using a similar argument as that in the proof of (3.2), we have

$$< u^\delta(\cdot,t) >^\alpha \le C + C\sigma^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}},\ \alpha \in (0,1), \tag{4.2}$$

$$\|u^\delta(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \le C + C\sigma^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\int_{T_1}^T \|u^\delta(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}dt \le C(T - T_1 + T^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} - T_1^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}),\ 0 \le T_1 < T < \infty. \tag{4.4}$$

This implies that $X^{\delta}(\cdot, x_0)$ is Hölder continuous on $[0, \infty)$, uniformly in δ. Therefore, there is a subsequence $X^{\delta_j}(\cdot, x_0)$ and a Hölder continuous map $X(\cdot, x_0)$ such that $X^{\delta_j}(\cdot, x_0) \to X(\cdot, x_0)$ uniformly on compacts sets in $[0, \infty)$. From this uniform convergence and (3.4), we have that $X(\cdot, x_0)$ satisfies (1.22).

Next we prove the uniqueness and continuous dependence for integral curves of u. Thus, let $X_1(\cdot, y_1)$ and $X_2(\cdot, y_2)$ be any two integral curves of u with respective initial points $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and define

$$g(t) = \frac{|u(X_2(t, y_2), t) - u(X_1(t, y_1), t)|}{m(|X_2(t, y_2) - X_1(t, y_1)|)},$$

and

$$g^{\delta}(t) = \frac{|u^{\delta}(X_2(t, y_2), t) - u^{\delta}(X_1(t, y_1), t)|}{m(|X_2(t, y_2) - X_1(t, y_1)|)},$$

for $t \in [0, \infty)$, where

$$m(x) = \begin{cases} x(1 - \ln x), & 0 < x \leq 1, \\ x, & 1 \leq x < \infty. \end{cases}$$

From (1.22), we get

$$|X_2(t, y_2) - X_1(t, y_1)| \leq |y_2 - y_1| + \int_0^t g(s) m(|X_2(s, y_2) - X_1(s, y_1)|) ds. \tag{4.5}$$

Denote by $< v >_{LL}$ the log-Lipschtz seminorm of a given vector field v on $\mathbb{R}^2$:

$$< v >_{LL} = \sup_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \\ x \neq y}} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|}{m(|x - y|)}.$$

From (2.24) and Proposition 2.3.7 in [3], we have

$$g^{\delta}(t) \leq < u^{\delta}(\cdot, t) >_{LL} \leq C \|u^{\delta}\|_{B^1_{\infty,\infty}} \leq C(\|u^{\delta}\|_{L^2} + \|F^{\delta}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho^{\delta} - \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^\infty} + \|w^{\delta}\|_{L^\infty}).$$

From (1.13), (2.5), (2.18) and (2.52), we obtain

$$\int_0^T g^{\delta} dt \leq C(1 + T).$$

Using (3.4) and Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\int_0^t g(s) ds \leq \liminf_{\delta \to 0} \int_0^t g^{\delta}(s) ds \leq C(1 + T).$$

Using Gronwall inequality in (4.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |X_2(t, y_2) - X_1(t, y_1)| &\leq \exp(1 - e^{-\int_0^t g ds}) |y_2 - y_1|^{\exp(-\int_0^t g ds)} \\ &\leq \exp(1 - e^{-C(1+T)}) |y_2 - y_1|^{\exp(-C(1+T))}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Thus, if $y_1 = y_2$, then $X_1 = X_2$. There is therefore exactly one integral curve originating from a given point at time $t = 0$. From this uniqueness, we obtain that the convergence $X^{\delta}(t, y_1) \to X(t, y_1)$ uniformly on compact sets in $[0, \infty)$ for entire sequence $\delta \to 0$, independently of y_1.

(2). We prove the injection of X at first. Suppose that $X(t, y_1) = X(t, y_2)$ for some $t > 0$ and $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then for any $s \in [0, t)$,

$$|X(s, y_1) - X(s, y_2)| \leq \int_s^t < u(\tau, \cdot) >_{LL} m(|X(\tau, y_1) - X(\tau, y_2)|) d\tau.$$

Using a similar argument as that in the proof of (4.6), we have that $X(s, y_1) = X(s, y_2)$ for all $s \in [0, t]$.

Next we show that $X(t,\cdot)|_\Omega$ is an open mapping. Let A be an open subset of Ω, $y_1 \in A$ and $B_{r_1}(y_1) \subset A$, $0 \le s < t$, $z_1 = X(t, y_1)$. From (1.22), using a similar argument as that in the proof of (4.6), we have

$$|X(s, y_1) - X(s; z, t)| \le \exp(1 - e^{-C(1+t)})|z_1 - z|^{\exp(-C(1+t))}.$$

Thus, there is a sufficient small constant r_2 such that, if $z \in B_{r_2}(z_1)$, then

$$|y_1 - X(0; z, t)| < r_1. \tag{4.7}$$

Thus $X(0; z, t) \in B_{r_1}(y_1) \subset A$ if $z \in B_{r_2}(z_1)$. From the uniqueness of the integral curves of u, we obtain that $z = X(t, X(0; z, t)) \in X(t,\cdot)A$. Therefore, $B_{r_2}(z_1) \subset X(t,\cdot)A$, and $X(t,\cdot)|_\Omega$ is an open mapping.

(3). Using a similar argument as that in the proof of (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X(t_2, y_2) - X(t_2, y_1)| &\le \exp(1 - e^{-\int_{t_1}^{t_2} g ds})|X(t_1, y_2) - X(t_1, y_1)|^{\exp(-\int_{t_1}^{t_2} g ds)} \\ &\le \exp(1 - e^{-C(1+T)})|X(t_1, y_2) - X(t_1, y_1)|^{\exp(-C(1+T))}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves part (3).

(4). Part (4) of Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of part (3). ☐

To prove Theorem 1.3, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Given $x \in X(t,\cdot)V$, say $x = X(t, y)$ with $y \in V$, there is a sequence $\delta_j \to 0$, which may depend on x, such that $X^{\delta_j}(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$ tends to y as $\delta_j \to 0$.*

Proof. Using the argument as that in the proof of Part (1) of Theorem 1.2, we have that integral curves $X^\delta(s; x, t)$ of the approximate velocity field u^δ, defined by

$$X^\delta(s; x, t) = x - \int_s^t u^\delta(X^\delta(\tau; x, t), \tau)d\tau,$$

are Hölder continuous in $s \in [0, t]$, uniformly with respect to δ. Therefore, there is a sequence $\delta_j \to 0$ and a map $\tilde{X} \in C([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $X^{\delta_j}(\cdot; x, t)$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{X}(\cdot)$, which satisfies

$$\tilde{X}(s) = x - \int_s^t u(\tilde{X}(\tau), \tau)d\tau, \ \ 0 \le s \le t.$$

From the uniqueness of integral curves proved in Part (1) of Theorem 1.2, we have that $\tilde{X}(t) = X(t, y)$. Taking $s = 0$, from (3.4) and (4.3), we get that $y^{\delta_j} = X^{\delta_j}(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$ converges to y as δ_j tends to zero. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.3.

Applying a standard maximum principle to the mass equation, using a similar argument as that in the proof of Proposition 2.7, we have

$$\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t, y), t) \ge \underline{\rho}^-,$$

for any $y \in V$, and all δ sufficiently small. Let $x = X(t, y) \in V^t$ and $y^\delta = X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$. From Lemma 4.1, we have that there is a sequence δ_j tending to zero such that y^{δ_j} tends to $y \in V$. Then, for all sufficient small δ_j, we get

$$y^{\delta_j} \in V \ \text{ and } \ \rho^{\delta_j}(x, t) = \rho^{\delta_j}(X^{\delta_j}(t, y^{\delta_j}), t) \ge \underline{\rho}^-.$$

From the convergence $\rho^\delta \to \rho$ (which holds for a.a. x), we obtain that

$$\rho(x, t) = \rho(X(t, y), t) \ge \underline{\rho}^-,$$

for all $y \in V$. From Part (2) of Theorem 1.2, we can finish the proof of this theorem. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.4.

For any $y \in U$, there is a sufficient small δ_0 such that

$$\text{dist}(y, \partial U) \ge 2\delta_0.$$

Let $U_{\delta_0} = \{x \in U | \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial U) \geq \delta_0\}$. Then, we have

$$\rho_0^\delta|_{U_{\delta_0}} = \delta, \ \forall \ \delta \leq \delta_0.$$

From (2.52) and (2.54), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t,z),t)) &\leq \Lambda(\rho_0^\delta(z)) - \int_0^t P(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(s,z),s))ds + tP(\tilde{\rho}) + \int_0^t \|F^\delta(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\infty} ds \\ &\leq \Lambda(\delta) + C(T), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, $\delta \leq \delta_0$ and all $z \in U_{\delta_0}$. Since $\Lambda(C\delta) - \Lambda(\delta) \geq 2\mu(\ln(C\delta) - \ln\delta) = 2\mu \ln C$, then we have

$$\Lambda(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t,z),t)) \leq \Lambda(\delta) + \Lambda(C(T)\delta) - \Lambda(\delta) = \Lambda(C(T)\delta),$$

and

$$\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t,z),t) \leq C(T)\delta \leq C(T)\delta_0,$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$, $\delta \leq \delta_0$ and all $z \in U_{\delta_0}$. Let $x = X(t,y) \in U^t$ and $y^\delta = X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$. From Lemma 4.1, we have that there is a sequence δ_j tending to zero such that y^{δ_j} tends to $y \in U_{\delta_0}$. Then, for all sufficient small δ_j, we get

$$y^{\delta_j} \in U_{\delta_0} \text{ and } \rho^{\delta_j}(x,t) = \rho^\delta(X^{\delta_j}(t,y^{\delta_j}),t) \leq C(T)\delta_0,$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. From the convergence $\rho^\delta \to \rho$ (which holds for a.a. x), we obtain that

$$\rho(x,t) = \rho(X(t,y),t) \leq C(T)\delta_0,$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$. Letting $\delta_0 \to 0$, we get that $\rho(X(t,y),t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. From Part (2) of Theorem 1.2, we obtain $\rho(\cdot,t)|_{U^t} = 0$, $t \in [0,T]$.

From (2.22), (2.26) and (2.29), we have

$$\int_1^\infty \int (|\rho^\delta - \tilde{\rho}|^4 + |F^\delta|^4) dxdt \leq C.$$

From the convergence of $\{\rho^\delta\}$ and $\{F^\delta\}$, we get

$$\int_1^\infty \int (|\rho - \tilde{\rho}|^4 + |F|^4) dxdt \leq C. \tag{4.8}$$

From (2.25), we have

$$\int |\rho^\delta - \tilde{\rho}|^4(x,t)dx \leq \int |\rho^\delta - \tilde{\rho}|^4(x,s)dx + C\int_N^{N+1} \int |F^\delta|^4 dxdt,$$

where $s, t \in [N, N+1]$, $N > 1$. Integrating it with s in $[N, N+1]$, we obtain

$$\sup_{t \in [N,N+1]} \int |\rho^\delta - \tilde{\rho}|^4(x,t)dx \leq C\int_N^{N+1} \int (|\rho^\delta - \tilde{\rho}|^4 + |F^\delta|^4) dxdt.$$

From the convergence of $\{\rho^\delta\}$ and $\{F^\delta\}$, we get

$$\sup_{t \in [N,N+1]} \int |\rho - \tilde{\rho}|^4(x,t)dx \leq C\int_N^{N+1} \int (|\rho - \tilde{\rho}|^4 + |F|^4) dxdt.$$

Letting $N \to \infty$, using (4.8), we can easily obtain (1.24)–(1.25). □

5 Propagation of Singularities

Before proving Theorem 1.5, using the similar method in [6], we give the following three lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $R > 0$, there are positive constants δ_0 and r_0, and a subsequence $\delta \equiv \delta_j \to 0$, such that $X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}B_{r_0}(x_0^t) \subset B_R(x_0)$ for all $\delta \leq \delta_0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, there is a sequence $\delta \to 0$ such that $y_0^\delta := X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x_0^t)$ tends to x_0 as $\delta \to 0$. Therefore, it suffices to show that there is a positive constant r_0 such that $|X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x) - y_0^\delta| < R$ for sufficiently small δ and for all $x \in B_{r_0}(x_0^t)$.

Letting $y^\delta = X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$, from (4.1), we have

$$X^\delta(s;x,t) - X^\delta(s;x_0^t,t) = x - \int_s^t u^\delta(X^\delta(\tau;x,t),\tau)d\tau - x_0^t + \int_s^t u^\delta(X^\delta(\tau;x_0^t,t),\tau)d\tau,$$

for any $s \in [0,t)$. Using a similar argument as that in the proof (4.7), we have

$$|y^\delta - y_0^\delta| \leq \exp(1 - e^{-C(1+t)})|x_0^t - x|^{\exp(-C(1+t))} < R$$

of sufficiently small radius r_0. Then, we finish the proof. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\delta \to 0$ be the sequence of Lemma 5.1, then for all $r_0 > 0$, $X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1} \to X(t,\cdot)^{-1}$ uniformly on $B_{r_0}(x_0^t)$.*

Proof. Let $y^\delta := X^\delta(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$ and $y := X(t,\cdot)^{-1}(x)$ for $x \in B_{r_0}(x_0^t)$. For $0 \leq s \leq t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |X^\delta(s,y^\delta) - X(s,y)| \\
= & \left| x - \int_s^t u^\delta(X^\delta(\tau,y^\delta),\tau)d\tau - x + \int_s^t u(X(\tau,y),\tau)d\tau \right| \\
\leq & \int_s^t |u^\delta(X^\delta(\tau,y^\delta),\tau) - u^\delta(X(\tau,y),\tau)|d\tau + \int_s^t |u(X(\tau,y),\tau) - u^\delta(X(\tau,y),\tau)|d\tau \\
\leq & \int_s^t g^\delta(\tau)m(|X^\delta(\tau,y^\delta) - X(\tau,y)|)d\tau + \int_s^t |u(X(\tau,y),\tau) - u^\delta(X(\tau,y),\tau)|d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument as that in the proof (4.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |y^\delta - y| = |X^\delta(0,y^\delta) - X(0,y)| \\
\leq & \exp(1 - e^{-C(1+T)}) \left(\int_s^t |u(X(\tau,y),\tau) - u^\delta(X(\tau,y),\tau)|d\tau \right)^{\exp(-C(1+T))}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (4.4) and the uniform convergence of u^δ to u on compact sets in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,\infty)$, we can get that $y^\delta(x) \to y(x)$ uniformly on $B_{r_0}(x_0^t)$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Given r_0 sufficiently small and given $t > 0$, there is a nondecreasing function $\eta : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\lim_{r\to 0}\eta(r) = 0$ such that, for δ as in Lemma 5.2 sufficient small,*

$$|X^\delta(t_2,y_2) - X^\delta(t_2,y_1)| \leq \eta(|X^\delta(t_1,y_2) - X^\delta(t_1,y_1)|),$$

where $t_1, t_2 \in [0,t]$ and $X^\delta(t,y_1)$, $X^\delta(t,y_2) \in B_{r_0}(x_0^t)$.

Proof. We have that, for $0 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq t$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |X^\delta(t_2,y_2) - X^\delta(t_2,y_1)| \\
\leq & |X^\delta(t_1,y_2) - X^\delta(t_1,y_1)| + \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |u^\delta(X^\delta(s,y_1^\delta),s) - u^\delta(X^\delta(s,y_2^\delta),s)|ds \right| \\
\leq & |X^\delta(t_1,y_2) - X^\delta(t_1,y_1)| + \int_0^t g^\delta(s)m(|X^\delta(s,y_1^\delta) - X^\delta(s,y_2^\delta)|)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument as that in the proof (4.6), we obtain

$$|X^\delta(t_2,y_2)-X^\delta(t_2,y_1)|\le \exp(1-e^{-C(1+t)})|X^\delta(t_1,y_2)-X^\delta(t_1,y_1)|^{\exp(-C(1+t))}.$$

This finishes the proof of this lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5.

First, we show that

$$\operatorname{osc}(\rho;x_0^t,E^t)\le \operatorname{osc}(\rho;x_0^t,(E\cap B)^t)=0, \tag{5.1}$$

for some open ball B centered at x_0, where $(E\cap B)^t:=X(t,\cdot)(E\cap B)$. In deed, since the map $X(t,\cdot)^{-1}:V^t\to V$ is continuous by Theorem 1.3 (2), there is a positive constant r_B such that $B_{r_1}(x_0^t)\subset B^t$ for $0<r_1\le r_B$. This implies that $E^t\cap B_{r_1}(x_0^t)\subset (E\cap B)^t$, so that, for any $R>0$ and $r_1\le\min\{R,r_B\}$,

$$(\text{esssup}-\text{essinf})\rho(\cdot,t)|_{E^t\cap B_{r_1}(x_0^t)}\le (\text{esssup}-\text{essinf})\rho(\cdot,t)|_{(E\cap B)^t\cap B_R(x_0^t)}.$$

Letting first $r_1\to 0$ and then $R\to 0$, we can obtain (5.1).

Case 1. If $\lim_{R\to 0}\text{essinf}\rho_0|_{E\cap B_R(x_0)}=0$, then for any $\delta_0>0$, there exists $r_0>0$ such that $\rho_0|_{E\cap B_{r_0}(x_0)}\le\delta_0$. Using a similar argument as that in the proof of Theorem 1.4, we have

$$\rho|_{(E\cap B_{r_0}(x_0))^t}\le C(T)\delta_0,$$

and

$$\operatorname{osc}(\rho(\cdot,t);x_0^t,(E\cap B_{r_0}(x_0))^t)\le C(T)\delta_0,\ t\in(0,T].$$

From (5.1), we have

$$\operatorname{osc}(\rho(\cdot,t);x_0^t,E^t)\le C(T)\delta_0,\ 0<t\le T.$$

Letting $\delta_0\to 0$, we get

$$\operatorname{osc}(\rho(\cdot,t);x_0^t,E^t)=0.$$

Case 2. If $\lim_{R\to 0}\text{essinf}\rho_0|_{E\cap B_R(x_0)}>0$, then there exist $r_0>0$ and $\underline{\rho}>0$ such that $\rho_0|_{E\cap B_{r_0}(x_0)}\ge\underline{\rho}$.

Let B be an open ball centered at x_0 such that $\overline{B}\subset B_{r_0}(x_0)$. By Theorem 1.2 (2) and Lemma 5.1, we can choose a positive constant $r_1\in(0,r_0)$ such that, if $x_j=X(t,y_j)=X^\delta(t,y_j^\delta)\in B_{r_1}(x_0^t)\cap(E\cap B)^t$, $j=1,2$, then $y_j,y_j^\delta\in B\cap E$. From the mass equation (1.1) for (ρ^δ,u^δ), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Lambda(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t))|_{y_1}^{y_2} &= -P(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t))|_{y_1}^{y_2}-F^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t)|_{y_1}^{y_2}\\ &= -a(t)\Lambda(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t))|_{y_1}^{y_2}-F^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t)|_{y_1}^{y_2},\end{aligned}$$

where $a(t)=\frac{P(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t))|_{y_1}^{y_2}}{\Lambda(\rho^\delta(X^\delta(t;\cdot,0),t))|_{y_1}^{y_2}}$. From (1.13) and Theorem 1.3, we have $|a(t)|\le C$. Using Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&|\Lambda(\rho^\delta(x_2,t))-\Lambda(\rho^\delta(x_1,t))| \qquad (5.2)\\ \le\ & C(T)|\Lambda(\rho_0^\delta(y_2^\delta))-\Lambda(\rho_0^\delta(y_1^\delta))|+C(T)\int_0^t|F^\delta(X^\delta(s,y_2^\delta),s)-F^\delta(X^\delta(s,y_1^\delta),s)|ds\\ \le\ & C(T)|\Lambda(\rho_0^\delta(y_2^\delta))-\Lambda(\rho_0^\delta(y_1^\delta))|+C(T)\sup_{0\le s\le t}|X^\delta(s,y_2^\delta)-X^\delta(s,y_1^\delta)|^{\frac{q}{2+q}}\int_0^t g_{F^\delta}ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $g_{F^\delta}(s)=<F^\delta(\cdot,s)>_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{\frac{q}{2+q}}$. Using a similar argument as that in Proposition 2.6, we have

$$\int_0^T g_{F^\delta}ds\le C(T). \tag{5.3}$$

From Lemma 5.3, we obtain

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}|X^\delta(s,y_2^\delta)-X^\delta(s,y_1^\delta)|^{\frac{q}{2+q}}\le(\eta(|x_2-x_1|))^{\frac{q}{2+q}}\le(\eta(2r_1))^{\frac{q}{2+q}}. \tag{5.4}$$

Since $y_j \in E \cap B$, there is a $r_2 > 0$ such that $B_{r_2}(y_j) \subset E \cap B$. By Lemma 5.2, $y_j^\delta \in B_{\frac{r_2}{2}}(y_j)$ for δ sufficiently small. Thus, if $\delta < \frac{r_2}{2}$, then $|y - y_j| \le |y - y_j^\delta| + |y_j^\delta - y_j| \le \delta + \frac{r_2}{2} < r_2$ for all $y \in B_\delta(y_j^\delta)$; that is $B_\delta(y_j^\delta) \subset B_{r_2}(y_j) \subset E \cap B$. Also, by lemmas 5.2-5.3, for $y \in B_\delta(y_j^\delta)$,

$$|y - x_0| \le |y - y_j^\delta| + |y_j^\delta - y_j| + |y_j - x_0| \le \delta + |y_j^\delta - y_j| + \eta(r_1) \le 2\eta(r_1),$$

that is, $B_\delta(y_j^\delta) \subset B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)$ for δ sufficiently small. Thus, $B_\delta(y_j^\delta) \subset (E \cap B) \cap B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)$. Then, since $\rho_0^\delta(y_j^\delta) = \int_{B_\delta(y_j^\delta)} j_\delta(y_j^\delta - y)\rho_0^\delta(y)dy + \delta$, we have

$$\text{essinf}\rho_0|_{(E\cap B)\cap B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)} \le \rho_0^\delta(y_j^\delta) - \delta \le \text{esssup}\rho_0|_{(E\cap B)\cap B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)}. \tag{5.5}$$

From (5.2)–(5.5), we obtain

$$|\Lambda(\rho^\delta(x_2,t)) - \Lambda(\rho^\delta(x_1,t))| \le C(T)(\text{esssup} - \text{essinf})\rho_0|_{(E\cap B)\cap B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)} + C(T)\eta(r_1)^{\frac{q}{2+q}},$$

for $x_1, x_2 \in (E \cap B)^t \cap B_{r_1}(x_0^t)$, sufficiently small $r_1 > 0$ and sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Taking the limit as $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$|\Lambda(\rho(x_2,t)) - \Lambda(\rho(x_1,t))| \le C(T)(\text{esssup} - \text{essinf})\rho_0|_{(E\cap B)\cap B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)} + C(T)\eta(r_1)^{\frac{q}{2+q}},$$

for $x_1, x_2 \in (E \cap B)^t \cap B_{r_1}(x_0^t)$ and sufficiently small $r_1 > 0$. Then, we have

$$(\text{esssup} - \text{essinf})\rho|_{(E\cap B)^t\cap B_{r_1}(x_0^t)} \le C(T)(\text{esssup} - \text{essinf})\rho_0|_{(E\cap B)\cap B_{2\eta(r_1)}(x_0)} + C(T)\eta(r_1)^{\frac{q}{2+q}},$$

for sufficiently small $r_1 > 0$. Letting $r_1 \to 0$, using the condition $\text{osc}(\rho_0; x_0, E \cap B) = 0$, we obtain $\text{osc}(\rho(\cdot,t); x_0^t, (E \cap B)^t) = 0$. From (5.1), we complete the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6.

It follows immediately from Theorem 1.5 that, under the conditions of Theorem 1.6 (a), $\rho(\cdot,t)$ has a one-sided limit with respect to $\mathcal{M}^t := X(t,\cdot)\mathcal{M}$ at the point $X(t,x_0)$. Then, since $F = (\lambda+\mu)\text{div}u - P(\rho) + P(\tilde\rho)$ is Hölder continuous for $t > 0$ by (1.18), $\text{div}u(\cdot,t)$ has a one-sided limit with respect to $\mathcal{M}^t := X(t,\cdot)\mathcal{M}$ at the point $X(t,x_0)$. If these limits exist from both sides of $\mathcal{M}$ at x_0, using the Hölder continuity of F, then the Rankine-Hugoniot condition (1.26) holds at the point $X(t,x_0)$.

To prove the regularity assertions in Theorem 1.6 (a), we consider the following two case.

Case 1. If $\rho_0(x_0+) = 0$, then using a similar argument as that in the proof of Theorem 1.4, we have $\rho(X(t,x_0)+,t) = 0$ for each $t > 0$. Thus, the maps $t \mapsto \rho(X(t,x_0)+,t)$ and $t \mapsto P(\rho(X(t,x_0)+,t))$ are in $C^1([0,\infty))$.

Case 2. If $\rho_0(x_0+) > 0$, then there exist $\underline{\rho} > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$, such that $\rho_0|_{E_+\cap B_{r_0}(x_0)} \ge \underline{\rho}$. Denote $\Lambda^\delta := \Lambda(\rho^\delta)$ and $\Lambda := \Lambda(\rho)$. From (1.21), we have

$$\Lambda_t^\delta + u^\delta \cdot \nabla\Lambda^\delta = -F^\delta - P(\rho^\delta) + P(\tilde\rho).$$

We will choose a sequence of smooth test functions $\{\phi^{\delta,h}\}_{\delta,h>0}$ satisfying the equation $\phi_t^{\delta,h} + \text{div}(\phi^{\delta,h}u^\delta) = 0$, so that

$$\int \phi^{\delta,h}\Lambda^\delta dx\Big|_0^t = -\int_0^t\int \phi^{\delta,h}(F^\delta + P(\rho^\delta) - P(\tilde\rho))dxds. \tag{5.6}$$

To construct $\phi^{\delta,h}$, we let $\{x_h\}_{h>0}$ be a sequence in E_+ and $\{r_h\}$ a sequence of positive numbers such that $x_h \to x_0$ and $r_h \to 0$ as $h \to 0$, and $B_{2r_h}(x_h) \subset E_+ \cap B_{r_0}(x_0)$. Then, define $\phi^{\delta,h}$ the solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \phi_t^{\delta,h} + \text{div}(\phi^{\delta,h}u^\delta) = 0, \\ \phi^{\delta,h}|_{t=0} = \phi_0^h, \end{cases}$$

where ϕ_0^h is a smooth function with support in $B_{r_h}(x_h)$, $\int \phi_0^h dx = 1$ and $0 \le \phi_0^h \le C^h$. It follows that $\phi^{\delta,h}$ has support in $X^\delta(t,\cdot)B_{r_h}(x_h)$, $\int \phi^{\delta,h}(x,t)dx = 1$ for $t > 0$, and $0 \le \phi^{\delta,h} \le C^h(T)$ for $0 \le t \le T$. This last assertion is a consequence of (2.52).

In the following, we will take limits as δ and h go to zero in (5.6). Form Lemma 5.2, we have X^δ converges uniformly to X on $[0,t] \times B_{r_0}(x_0)$ as $\delta \to 0$. Then, we can easily prove that, for each $h > 0$, there is a $\delta_0(h) > 0$ such that

$$X^\delta(s,\cdot)B_{r_h}(x_h) \subset X(s,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h),\ 0 < \delta < \delta_0(h). \tag{5.7}$$

We now obtain uniform bounds of the three terms in (5.6). For fixed $t > 0$, we get

$$\int \phi^{\delta,h}\Lambda^\delta dx = \int \phi^{\delta,h}(\Lambda^\delta - \Lambda)dx + \int \phi^{\delta,h}\Lambda dx := I + II.$$

From the convergence of ρ^δ and (1.13), we obtain that $I \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$, and I is bounded by $C^h(T)$. Also, from (5.7), we have

$$\text{essinf}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)} \le II \le \text{esssup}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)},$$

for sufficiently small δ. Thus, there exists $\delta_0(h) > 0$

$$\text{essinf}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)} - h \le \int \phi^{\delta,h}\Lambda^\delta dx \le \text{esssup}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)} + h, \tag{5.8}$$

for $\delta \le \delta_0(h)$.

Let $\Lambda(x_0^t+,t) := \Lambda(\rho(x_0^t+,t))$. Then,

$$\Lambda(x_0^t+,t) = \lim_{r'\to 0} \text{esssup}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{B_{r'}(x_0^t)\cap E_+^t} = \lim_{r'\to 0} \text{essinf}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{B_{r'}(x_0^t)\cap E_+^t}.$$

For each $r' > 0$, we can choose $h_{r'} > 0$ such that $X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h) \subset B_{r'}(x_0^t) \cap E_+^t$ for all $h \le h_{r'}$. Thus, for each $r' > 0$ and all $h \le h_{r'}$,

$$\text{essinf}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{B_{r'}(x_0^t)\cap E_+^t} \le \text{essinf}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)} \le \text{esssup}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{B_{r'}(x_0^t)\cap E_+^t}.$$

Taking first the liminf and limsup as $h \to 0$ and then the limit as $r' \to 0$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \text{essinf}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)} = \Lambda(x_0^t+,t).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \text{esssup}\Lambda(\cdot,t)|_{X(t,\cdot)B_{2r_h}(x_h)} = \Lambda(x_0^t+,t).$$

From (5.8), we have

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\lim_{\delta\to 0} \int (\phi^{\delta,h}\Lambda^\delta)(x,t)dx = \Lambda(x_0^t+,t). \tag{5.9}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\lim_{\delta\to 0} \int (\phi^{\delta,h}\Lambda^\delta)(x,0)dx = \Lambda(x_0+,0), \tag{5.10}$$

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\lim_{\delta\to 0} \int_0^t \int (\phi^{\delta,h}F^\delta)(x,s)dxds = \int_0^t F(x_0^s+,s)ds, \tag{5.11}$$

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\lim_{\delta\to 0} \int_0^t \int \phi^{\delta,h}\{P(\rho^\delta) - P(\tilde\rho)\}dxds = \int_0^t \{P(\rho(x_0^s+,s)) - P(\tilde\rho)\}ds. \tag{5.12}$$

From (5.6) and (5.9)–(5.12), we have

$$\Lambda(x_0^t+,t) - \Lambda(x_0+,0) = -\int_0^t \{F(x_0^s+,s) + P(\rho(x_0^s+,s)) - P(\tilde\rho)\}ds. \tag{5.13}$$

Since F is locally Hölder continuous in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,\infty)$, standard ODE theory implies that the map $t \mapsto \Lambda(x_0^t+,t)$ is in $C([0,\infty)) \cap C^1((0,\infty))$. From (1.13), (1.16), (2.45) and (2.51), we have

$$\int_0^t \|F(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\infty} ds \le C\int_0^t (\sigma^{-2-\frac{q}{2}})^{\frac{1}{2+2q}} \le Ct^{\frac{3q}{4+4q}}.$$

Thus, map $t \mapsto \Lambda(x_0^t+, t)$ is in $C^{\frac{3q}{4+4q}}([0,\infty)) \cap C^1((0,\infty))$. From (1.13) and Theorem 1.3, the maps $t \mapsto \rho(X(t,x_0)+,t)$ and $t \mapsto P(\rho(X(t,x_0)+,t))$ are in $C^{\frac{3q}{4+4q}}([0,\infty)) \cap C^1((0,\infty))$.

Since F is locally Hölder continuous in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,\infty)$, then the map $t \mapsto \mathrm{div} u(X(t,x_0)+,t)$ is locally Hölder continuous on $(0,\infty)$. These finish the proof of Theorem 1.6 (a).

Then, we will prove Theorem 1.6 (c) as follows. From (5.13), we have

$$[\Lambda(x_0^t, t)] - [\Lambda(x_0, 0)] = -\int_0^t [P(\rho(x_0^s+, s))]ds = -\int_0^t a(s,x_0)[\Lambda(x_0^s+, s)]ds.$$

Using Gronwall's inequality, we can finish the proof of Theorem 1.6. □

6 Nonphysical solution

Proof of Theorem 1.7.

First, from (1.5), we have

$$\partial_r(\partial_r v + \frac{1}{r}v) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(U),$$

where $U = \{(r,t) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ | r \in (a(t), b(t))\}$. From the regularity (1.15), we have

$$v(r,t) = \alpha(t)r + \frac{\beta(t)}{r}, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(U), \tag{6.1}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in L^1_{loc}([0,\infty))$.

Then, from (1.30) and the regularity of the solution in Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = \left\{ vr\left((\lambda + 2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r}) - P(\varrho) \right) \right\}\Big|_{r=a(t)-0},$$

where

$$E(t) = \int_0^{a(t)} \left(\frac{1}{2}\varrho v^2 + \overline{G}(\varrho) \right) rdr + \int_0^t \int_0^{a(s)} (\lambda + 2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r})^2 rdrds.$$

From (1.15) and (1.26), we get

$$[v] = 0, \ [(\lambda(\varrho) + 2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r}) - P(\varrho)] = 0, \quad \text{at} \quad (a(t), t),$$

and since $\varrho(a(t)+0, t) = 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = a(t)v(a(t),t)(\lambda(0) + 2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r})(a(t)+0,t). \tag{6.2}$$

From (6.1), we have

$$(v_r + \frac{v}{r})(a(t)+0,t) = 2\frac{a(t)v(a(t),t) - b(t)v(b(t),t)}{a^2(t) - b^2(t)}. \tag{6.3}$$

From (6.2)–(6.3), we can immediately obtain (1.33). □

7 Non-global Existence of Regular Solutions

Proof of Theorem 1.8.

Since the support of the initial spherical symmetric density ρ_0 is compact, we can assume that

$$\mathrm{supp}\rho_0 = \Omega(0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 | |x| \le R_0\},$$

for some $R_0 > 0$. We set

$$\Omega(t) = \{x = X(t,\alpha) | \alpha \in \Omega(0)\}, \ t \in [0,T],$$

where $X(t,\alpha)$ is defined in Theorem 1.2. From the transport equation $(1.1)_1$, one can easily show that $\mathrm{supp}\rho(x,t) = \Omega(t) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 | |x| \le R(t)\}$. From (6.1), we have

$$v(r,t) = \alpha(t)r + \frac{\beta(t)}{r}, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(U),$$

where $u(x,t) = v(r,t)\frac{x}{r}$, $|x| = r$, $U = \{x \in \Omega^c(t), t \in [0,T]\}$. Since $u \in C^1([0,T];H^k)$, we have $u(x,t) \equiv 0$ in $x \in \Omega^c(t)$, and $\Omega(t) = \Omega(0)$ for all $0 < t < T$.

Now, we introduce the following functional as in [17, 18]:

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &= \int (x-(1+t)u)^2 \rho dx + \frac{2}{\gamma-1}(1+t)^2 \int A\rho^\gamma dx \\ &= \int x^2 \rho dx - 2(1+t)\int \rho u \cdot x dx + (1+t)^2 \int \left(\rho u^2 + \frac{2A}{\gamma-1}\rho^\gamma\right) dx, \ t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

Using (1.29)–(1.30), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H'(t) &= \frac{4(2-\gamma)(1+t)}{\gamma-1}\int_0^\infty A\varrho^\gamma r dr + 4(1+t)\int_0^\infty \lambda(v_r + \frac{v}{r}) r dr \\ &\quad -2(1+t)^2 \int_0^\infty (\lambda+2\mu)(v_r + \frac{v}{r})^2 r dr \\ &\le \frac{4(2-\gamma)(1+t)}{\gamma-1}\int_0^\infty A\varrho^\gamma r dr + 2\int_0^\infty c\varrho^\beta r dr \\ &\le \frac{4(2-\gamma)(1+t)}{\gamma-1}\int_0^\infty A\varrho^\gamma r dr + \frac{2c\beta}{\gamma}\int_0^\infty \varrho^\gamma r dr + \frac{2c(\gamma-\beta)}{\gamma}\Omega(0), \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

where $t \in [0,T]$. From (7.1)–(7.2), we get

$$H'(t) \le \frac{2(2-\gamma)}{1+t}H(t) + \frac{2c\beta(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma(1+t)^2}H(t) + \frac{2c(\gamma-\beta)}{\gamma}\Omega(0)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &\le (1+t)^{4-2\gamma} e^{-\frac{2c\beta(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma(1+t)}}\left(H(0) + \frac{2c(\gamma-\beta)}{\gamma}\Omega(0)\int_0^t (1+s)^{2\gamma-4} e^{\frac{2c\beta(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma(1+s)}} ds\right) \\ &\le (1+t)^{4-2\gamma}H(0) + \frac{2c(\gamma-\beta)}{\gamma}\Omega(0)e^{\frac{2c\beta(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma}}F(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $t \in [0,T]$ and

$$F(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1+t}{2\gamma-3}(1-(1+t)^{3-2\gamma}), & 2\gamma-3 \ne 0, \\ (1+t)^{4-2\gamma}\ln(1+t), & 2\gamma-3 = 0. \end{cases}$$

From (7.1), we have

$$\int A\rho^\gamma dx \le \frac{\gamma-1}{2}(1+t)^{2-2\gamma}H(0) + \frac{c(\gamma-1)(\gamma-\beta)}{\gamma}\Omega(0)e^{\frac{2c\beta(\gamma-1)}{A\gamma}}F(t)(1+t)^{-2} := G(t).$$

By the conservation of mass and Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\int \rho_0 dx = \int \rho dx \le \left(\int \rho^\gamma dx\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} (\Omega(0))^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \le \left(\frac{G(t)}{A}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} (\Omega(0))^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}}, \ t \in [0,T].$$

Since $\lim_{t\to\infty} G(t) = 0$, the above inequality implies that T must be finite. □

References

[1] D. Bresch, B. Desjardins, C. K. Lin, On some compressible fluid models: Korteweg, lubrication, and shallow water systems, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 28 (2003), no. 3-4, 843-868.

[2] D. Bresch, B. Desjardins, Existence of global weak solutions for a 2D viscous shallow water equations and convergence to the quasi-geostrophic model, Comm. Math. Phys. 238 (2003), no. 1-2, 211-223.

[3] J.-Y. Chemin, *Perfect incompressible fluids*, volume 14 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998. Translated from the 1995 French original by Isabelle Gallagher and Dragos Iftimie.

[4] R. Danchin, Local and global well-posedness results for flows of inhomogeneous viscous fluids. Adv. Differential Equations 9 (2004), no. 3-4, 353–386.

[5] D. Y. Fang, T. Zhang, Global solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for compressible flow with density-dependent viscosity and discontinuous initial data, J. Differential Equations 222 (2006) no. 1, 63–94.

[6] D. Hoff, M. M. Santos, Lagrangean structure and propagation of singularities in multidimensional compressible flow Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 188 (2008), no. 3, 509–543.

[7] D. Hoff, Compressible flow in a half-space with Navier boundary conditions. J. Math. Fluid Mech. 7 (2005), no. 3, 315–338.

[8] D. Hoff, Global solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for multidimensional compressible flow with discontinuous initial data, J. Differential Equations, 120 (1995), 215–254.

[9] D. Hoff, Strong convergence to global solutions for multidimensional flows of compressible, viscous fluids with polytropic equations of state and discontinuous initial data. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 132 (1995), no. 1, 1–14.

[10] D. Hoff, D. Serre, The failure of continuous dependence on initial data for the Navier-Stokes equations of compressible flow, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 51 (1991), no. 4, 887–898.

[11] S. Jiang, Z. P. Xin, P. Zhang, Global weak solutions to 1D compressible isentropic Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity, Methods and Applications of Analysis, 12 (2005), no. 3, 239–252.

[12] H. L. Li, J. Li, Z. P. Xin, Vanishing of vacuum states and blow-up phenomena of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations, Comm. Math. Phys. 281 (2008), no. 2, 401–444.

[13] P.-L. Lions, Mathematical Topics in Fluid Mechanics. Vol. 1-2. Oxford University Press: New York, 1996, 1998.

[14] T. P. Liu, Z. Xin,T. Yang, Vacuum states of compressible flow, Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems 4 (1998), no. 1, 1–32.

[15] A. Matsumura, T. Nishida, Initial-boundary value problems for the equations of motion of compressible viscous and heat-conductive fluids, Comm. Math. Phys. **89** (1983), no. 4, 445–464.

[16] V.A. Vaigant, A.V. Kazhikhov, On existence of global solutions to the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations for a compressible viscosity fluid. Siberian Math. J. 36 (1995), 1108–1141.

[17] Z. Xin, Blow-up of smooth solution to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with compact density, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 51 (3) (1998) 229–240.

[18] T. Yang, C.J. Zhu, Compressible Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate viscosity coefficient and vacuum, Comm. Math. Phys. 230 (2002), no. 2, 329–363.

[19] T. Zhang, D. Y. Fang, Global behavior of spherically symmetric Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity, J. Differential Equations 236 (2007), 293–341.